

DEC 22 1942

Volume LVII

JANUARY, 1942

Number 1

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE	
SALINGER, HERMAN.—Rilke's Opening Lines,	1	
PETERS, H. F.—Rilke—Rodin: A Correction,	9	
MAGOUN, F. P., JR.—Norman History in the "Lay of the Beach" ('Strandar ljög'),	11	
ROBBINS, R. H.—The Burden in Carols,	16	
DILTS, DOROTHY A.—John Gower and the 'De Genealogia Deorum,'	23	
DILTS, DOROTHY A.—Observations on Dante and the 'Hous of Fame,' . . .	26	
STEARNS, M. W.—Chaucer Mentions a Book,	28	
DUNCAN, E. H.—Chaucer and "Arnold of the Newe Toun,"	31	
BLENNER-HASSETT, R.—"When he His 'Papir' Soghte," CT A-4404,	34	
FUCILLA, J. G.—Sannazaro's 'Arcadia' and Gálvez de Montalvo's 'El Pastor de Filida,'	35	
KAHANE, RENÉE T.—Some Sandhi Phenomena in Modern Greek,	39	
KOCHER, P. H.—Some Nashe Marginalia Concerning Marlowe,	45	
JACKSON, J. L.—The Exchange of Weapons in 'Hamlet,'	50	
AVERY, E. L.—The Première of 'The Mourning Bride,'	55	
MATHEWS, E. G.—Cokain's 'The Obstinate Lady' and the 'Araucana,' . .	57	
KURRELMAYER, W.—Kaulbach's Illustrated Edition of Goethe's 'Reineke Fuchs,' 1846,	59	
SCHIROKAUER, ARNO.—Der Eingang des Lorsche Bienensegens,	62	
REVIEWS:—		
A. G. BRODEUR, Arthur, Dux Bellorum. [W. A. Nitze.]	64	
DUNCAN MALLAM (ed.), Letters of William Shenstone; MARJORIE WIL- LIAMS (ed.), The Letters of William Shenstone. [Robert Shafer.] . . .	68	
WILLIAM NELSON, John Skelton, Laureate. [Ray Heffner.]	72	
F. J. SCHMITZ, Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus. [George Stefansky.]	74	
BRONSON, CALDWELL, CLINE, MCKENZIE, ROSS, Five Studies in Literature. [M. W. Croll.]	76	
BRIEF MENTION: Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien; C. F. MULLETT (ed.), The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon; LORD DAVID CECIL (ed.), The Oxford Book of Christian Verse; AXEL OLBRIK (ed.), E. M. SMITH-DAMPIER (tr.), A Book of Danish Ballads; C. M. GARNIER, Eiré, Histoire d'Irlande; S. K. WORKMAN, Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose; ERNST BEUTLER (ed.), Goethes Rede zum Shakespears Tag; R. H. THOMAS, The Classical Ideal in German Literature; ALBERT FEUILLERAT, Baudelaire et la Belle aux cheveux d'or, . .		77
CORRESPONDENCE: Montaigne and Democracy; La Démocratie de Montaigne,		81

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE
HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Footnotes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verbatim quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RNS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

THE MIND OF A POET

A STUDY OF WORDSWORTH'S THOUGHT
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
THE PRELUDE

By RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Fifteen years have gone into this search for the hiding places of a poet's power. There are chapters on the part matter-of-factness, passion, fear, wonder, solitude, silence, and loneliness, animism, nature, anti-rationalism, the mystic experience, religion, and imagination played in the thought and poetry of Wordsworth. Other topics are considered more briefly and *The Prelude*, the most illuminating account in English of the mind of a poet, is examined in detail. Theory has not been imposed on poetry but Wordsworth's beliefs have been deduced and explained from what he himself wrote and said.

About 700 pages, two maps, buckram. \$5.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

JANUARY, 1942

Number 1

RILKE'S OPENING LINES

The choice of a poet's opening lines as an object of special study and scholarly interest is not at once self-explanatory or self-justifying. Two questions probably assert themselves promptly to the reader's mind: Can the opening line be treated apart from the stanza, from the poem as a whole, as an entity in itself? To which the answer is conditional. The second question concerns poets in general, Rilke in particular. Are we, by virtue of our present approach, suggesting its validity for all poets, or is it, for some reason, especially worth-while where Rilke is concerned? It is not here intended to endow the first line with an especial importance extending to all poets, nor would it be easy to generalize in the other direction, namely restrictively, excluding certain poets or certain literary periods.

It might prove true, on investigation, that the first lines of, let us say, Goethe, Heine, and Dehmel have certain distinctive qualities and a personality of their own, even that they are occasionally of real importance within their setting, and might, like any other poetic line, be taken as hallmarks of the poet, his style or his time. Such deliberations are, however, extrinsic.

Our consideration of Rilke's opening lines grew out of those lines themselves and what seems to be their deeply intrinsic significance to his art. For whatever the opening line accomplishes in the work of the other poets mentioned, it is doubtful whether it is as highly functional there as in the work of Rilke.

This fact becomes evident as soon as we examine the first lines. To an astonishing degree they evoke the totality of their poems and their poet. How symptomatic of its part of the *Stundenbuch*, for instance, is the line: "Ich liebe meines Wesens Dunkelstunden"¹

¹ *Das Stunden-Buch, I. Buch, Das Buch vom mönchischen Leben* (1899); *Ges. Werke* II, 176. (Not publ. until 1905).

and how significant of Rilke's monumental acceptance of self. Or again: "Ich lebe mein Leben in wachsenden Ringen,"² or "Ich glaube an alles noch nie Gesagte."³ Other initial lines bring out the tremendous stature of the Divinity he is addressing and the balances and contrasts inherent in the *Nebeneinander* of God and his poet: "Du, Nachbar Gott, wenn ich dich manches Mal"⁴—"Du Dunkelheit, aus der ich stamme,"⁵—"Du siehst, ich will viel."⁶—"Du bist so gross, dass ich schon nicht mehr bin, . . ."⁷ Around one such first line: "Ich bin, du Ängstlicher. Hörst du mich nicht" other lines crystallize; the ancient dichotomy of every poet's universe into *ich* and *du* is necessary before a confluence—not merely of two lovers, but of the universe and the individual—can be brought about a moment later:

Wenn du der Träumer bist, bin ich dein Traum.
Doch wenn du wachen willst, bin ich dein Wille . . .

Again, in one initial line, man's dependence on the Deity is so thoroughly reexperienced, undergoes such a creative reorganization that a single cry: "Was wirst du tun, Gott, wenn ich sterbe?"⁸ contains an entire poem, so that the remainder is a mere résumé in the form of enumeration and variation:

Ich bin dein Krug (wenn ich zerscherbe?)
Ich bin dein Trank (wenn ich verderbe?)
Bin dein Gewand und dein Gewerbe, . . .

and at the end, the first notes are still echoing: "Was wirst du tun, Gott? Ich bin bange."

The opening line, then, is apparently not an entity *per se*, in so far as it is discovered as one end of a bridge reaching to the last line. In fact, being organic and functional within the whole, critical interference is required to sever it and set it apart. Moreover, in Rilke a striving toward continuousness asserts itself early and remains an essential even in the late days at Muzot when, through solitude, he is hoping to reestablish what he calls "etwas von der Kontinuität meiner innerlichen Arbeit und Besinnung."¹⁰ This continuity should be present, as within the larger nature of the poet,

² *Ibid.*, 175.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 177.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 186.

³ *Ibid.*, 181.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 180.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 198.

¹⁰ Letter to Ilse Blumenthal-Weiss, 29. Dec. 1921; *Briefe aus Muzot*, p. 70 f.

so also in the smaller unit of his work. A distinction needs to be made: we are not aiming at establishing the first line as an independent existence, but merely as a working unit. Though not an entity *per se*, it can profitably and needs momentarily to be treated as such.

We experience the effect of one opening line after another unfolding. Can we measure these effects by shopworn rulers and rusted aesthetic scales? That is to risk losing the spirit, especially if we aim directly at a thorough-going classification. Yet if the opening line is anything more than merely the first in a series of poetic moments, if indeed it is the revealing symptom of an underlying urge, then certain means must lie at hand, by which we can determine its morphology and analyze its function.

One such means to suggest itself is Rilke's choice of words, specifically of grammatical forms: for instance, the frequent interrogative beginning. The abrupt "Was gibts?"¹¹ intentionally produces the effect of crudeness; the rhetorical questions to God in the *Stundenbuch* ("Was wirst du tun, Gott . . . ?" and others¹²) express an anxiety or even a dissatisfaction. Or the beginning question runs obligato-like through the first half of the poem *Musik*: "Was spielst du, Knabe?"¹³ The *Liebeslied* in *Neue Gedichte* opens with the first of four questions. The final image of the lovers, played upon like an instrument in the hand of some unseen player, is already prepared and their attitude of helplessness set in the opening question:¹⁴

Wie soll ich meine Seele halten, dass
sie nicht an deine rührt? . . .

Syntactically among the most striking types of beginning is the use of "Und . . ." to start many poems, no fewer, in fact, than three dozen, so that this type approaches almost to the point of mannerism. Its functional motivation, however, saves Rilke from such a charge, for example in *Fortschritt* (*Buch der Bilder*).¹⁵ The

¹¹ *Ges. Werke*, I, 82. (*Erste Gedichte, Larenopfer, 1896*. "Aus dem Dreissigjährigen Kriege / Kohlenskizzen in Callots Manier, 5.)

¹² II, 198 (s. above) and, e. g., II, 185: "Was irren meine Hände in den Pinseln?"

¹³ II, 22. *Buch der Bilder, I. Buch, I. Teil*. (Finished 1901, first edition published 1902.)

¹⁴ III, 9. *Neue Gedichte, I* (1907).

¹⁵ II, 57. *B. d. B., I. Buch, II. Teil*. (1902).

impression at which the entire little poem of nine lines aims (namely, the sense of a continuity within the poet's self, of time as a hinge between now and the immediate past, and the extension of that sense of continuity to all things and their images—"die Dinge und alle Bilder") this impression is already evoked by the opening, specifically by the unwasted initial notes, the anacrusis which Rilke refuses to waste:

Und wieder rauscht mein tiefes Leben lauter . . .

In this typical example, something is attained before the poem has begun. "Und wieder" enables the poetic experience to start *stante pede* on its level as a poetic experience, without having first to climb to it. A poem, although rounded in its outward plastic form, can thus remind us that, apart from its shape, it is of the *stuff* of all time and experience. Where the epic element is a strong undercurrent, as in the *Marien-Leben*, this becomes especially pronounced. "Und der Engel sprach und gab sich Mühe" ¹⁶ emphasizes that this is one happening in a series. Similarly in *Sankt Georg* ¹⁷ the story is so introduced that it seems an arbitrarily chosen point of beginning: "Und sie hatte ihn die ganze Nacht / angerufen." Actually this is meant to make us aware of a pre-history, to stir our sense of time. This opening forms the pattern which runs through the inner structure of the poem. Four successive sentences begin with *und*; around each sentence-nucleus a stanza has crystallized, giving a simple chain of events, linked among themselves by *und* and joined to the "backward and abyss of time" by the initial *und*.

Other vistas occasionally open. For instance, the beginning of the second of the *Sonnette an Orpheus* ("Und fast ein Mädchen wars und ging hervor"), ¹⁸ where the link is obviously to the preceding sonnet and the *es* is the sound itself of Orpheus' song, seems to run back two decades, as if in a cross-tide, to an opening line in the middle book of *Das Stundenbuch*: "Und meine Seele ist ein Weib vor dir." ¹⁹ This merely in passing.

¹⁶ II, 303 "Argwohn Josephs" (*Das Marien-Leben*, written 1912, publ. 1913.)

¹⁷ III, 217; in *Neue Gedichte, Anderer Teil* (written and publ., 1908).

¹⁸ III, 314; *Die Sonette an Orpheus, I. Teil, II.* (written 1922, publ. 1923).

¹⁹ II, 238; *Das Stunden-Buch, II. Buch: Das Buch der Pilgerschaft*

A final example of initial *Und* is its convincingly conscious use in the translation of Elizabeth Browning's Sonnets, especially in the first of them, where the original had: "I thought once how Theocritus had sung," but where Rilke, not content with the suddenness of this articulation, begins "Und es geschah mir einst, an Theokrit / zu denken, . . ." ²⁰ so that (in effect, and perhaps also in intent, not unlike the persistent beat of the opening movement of Brahms' First Symphony) we hear "time's wingèd chariot" and know again that what the poet is shaping is of a transcendent stuff out of larger experience.

Syntax and grammar are merely outward surveying instruments; the outlines they reveal are the result of inner layerings. On the grammatical level we see *und* as a conjunction and the likewise highly frequent *da* as an adverb; but on a higher level, in their initial setting, they are ligatures joining one moment in time to the stream of time. From the study of technique it is possible to rise to a realization of style. Ernst Elster long since pointed out the difference between the two: technique as "Handgriffe und Berechnungen," style as "Gestaltungskraft . . . aus dunklen Tiefen." ²¹ But in this connection it must be observed that an identity of outer structure and inner form is possible. It is appropriate to repeat what Hermann Weigand has already noted in "Das Wunder im Werk Rainer Maria Rilkes." ²² Regarding one instance of "Wunder" he remarks "dass der Satz selbst, als grammatisches Gebilde, das Wunder mitmacht." ²³

Obviously the opening line will indicate or forecast the rhythm. But besides determining inner structure or outer ligature, the *technique* of the opening is frequently to initiate the leading metaphor, which may, then, in deeper recesses, contain at least the germ of the central idea. A thorough-going analysis of opening metaphors is not possible here. In *Mädchenmelancholie* the first line ("Mir fällt ein junger Ritter ein") ²⁴ not only determines

(written 1901, publ. 1905). The second sonnet seems also to touch a passage in *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*, v, 95 (begun 1904, finished 1910).

²⁰ VI, 7.

²¹ *Prinzipien der Literaturwissenschaft*, II. Bd. (Stilistik), Halle, 1911, p. 8.

²² *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht*, Jan. 1939, XXXI, 1, pp. 1-21.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

²⁴ II, 13. *B. d. B., I. Buch, I. Teil* (1901); publ. 1902).

fourteen of the nineteen end-rhymes; it presents the image "junger Ritter" which is the vehicle for the central idea. The whole background for *Aus einer Kindheit* and, augmented by alliteration, much of the mood is set by the opening: "Das Dunkeln war wie Reichtum in dem Raume, / darin der Knabe, sehr verheimlicht, sass. . . ." ²⁵ Of the *Frühe Gedichte* one begins: "Ich will ein Garten sein," ²⁶ plunging immediately into the central metaphorical image, at once translatable for us also into the language of deeper psychological interpretation, for it typifies Rilke in his early self-expressive stage.

It is also in the opening line that Rilke exerts two of his most powerful devices: namely, anticipation and delay. Both aim at suspense. In *Abschied* the opening presents the maximum of anticipation: "Wie hab ich das gefühlt, was Abschied heisst." ²⁷ Is this not the *Endergebnis* of the poetic experience? What more is there? This opening pushes the experience so far into the past among completely finished emotional events, that only the reinvigorating second line ("Wie weiss ichs noch") can rescue it again. The apparently empty word *das* of the first line holds so much meaning "ganz klein zusammengefaltet . . . , wie ein italienisches Seidentuch in eine Nusschale" (to quote a phrase from an early letter) ²⁸ that the remainder seems for a moment deflated, and the reader thus spurred to equal the poet's experience in order to achieve this *das* for himself. Similarly, Hermann Weigand, though writing of quite another poem, observes: "Schon dieser erste Vers mit seinem hinweisenden 'das' zwingt das Auge, sich auf das Sehen einzustellen, wo noch nichts zu sehen ist." ²⁹

Retardation is the closely-related opposite of this anticipation. "Auf einmal ist aus allem Grün im Park / man weiss nicht was, ein Etwas fortgenommen." ³⁰ "Auf einmal" has so speeded the action, that for the reader, from whom the scene is still hidden, the remainder is painfully delayed and the suspense "*Vor dem Som-*

²⁵ II, 31. For dates, s. above; on the phrase "Reichtum in dem Raume," cf. letter of 24. Jan. 1901 to Paula Becker, *Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 95, where we read: "unrechtmässiger Reichtum des Raumes."

²⁶ I, 257.

²⁷ III, 62. *Neue Gedichte, I. Teil* (1907).

²⁸ Letter of 23. Oct. 1900 (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 57).

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

³⁰ III, 66. *Neue Ged.*, I.

merregen" is rendered oppressive. Is it anticipation or retardation when the opening "Das alles stand auf ihr und war die Welt"³¹ temporarily veils the identity of "das alles" and the principal figure as well? These instances have all been from *Neue Gedichte*, where the type seems especially pronounced, but a striking example occurs in *Erste Gedichte*. Rilke stands before a museum reproduction of the room where one Kajetan Tyl wrote the Bohemian anthem. "Da also hat der arme Tyl / sein Lied 'Kde domov můj' geschrieben."³² Only the long prose subtitle, by explaining the situation, somewhat mitigates the irony of the *also*, by which the poet puts himself far deeper into the experience than his reader can yet be.

The importance of titles in conjunction with first lines deserves more attention than allowable here, for instance *Das Stundenbuch* and its opening: "Da neigt sich die Stunde und rührt mich an."³³ *Leda, Der Tod Moses*³⁴ and others would be quite incomprehensible without the title, despite the presupposition of a cultivated reader, acquainted with the legend. The same is true where Rilke creates his own legend and magic, as in *Der Stifter* or *Der Goldschmied*.³⁵

When we have perceived the colorful urgency of "Ich will ein Garten sein" (*Frühe Gedichte*),³⁶ the plastic monotony in the vowel pattern of "Sein Blick ist vom Vorübergehn der Stäbe" (*Neue Gedichte*)³⁷ and heard the alliteration and assonance of one of the Sonnets, opening like a magic spell: "Irgendwo wohnt das Gold in der verwöhnenden Bank . . ." ³⁸ where sound and sense combine, then we realize that a panorama of first lines substantiates Rilke's transition through successive stages from impressionism to *Gestalt* and on to *mystische Sachlichkeit*.

Our aim has not been the presentation of empty forms, but discovery and communication of material saturated with the poet's personality and which, through such communication, can be re-experienced by us. Perhaps we cannot realize how high is this

³¹ III, 58; as above.

³² I, 60. *Erste Gedichte; Larenopfer* (1896).

³³ II, 175. *Stundenbuch, I* (1899).

³⁴ III, 120 (*Neue Ged.*, *Anderer Teil*, 1908) and III, 404 (*Letzte Ged. und Fragmentarisches*) respectively.

³⁵ III, 48 (*Neue Ged.*, I) and III, 440 (*Letzte Ged. u. Fragm.*) respectively. Cf. H. Weigand, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 12 and 13.

³⁶ I, 257.

³⁷ III, 44 (*Neue Gedichte, I.*)

³⁸ III, 363 (*Die Sonette an Orpheus, II. Teil*. 1922, publ. 1923.)

degree of saturation until we draw upon the *Briefe und Tagebücher*. Out of phrases in them a poem sometimes springs to life. "Es ist eine Abendstunde. . . . Keine grosse goldene . . ." ³⁹ reminds us in its effect of many first lines (it has the cadence of "Keine weinende Frau," ⁴⁰ though that is not a first line). We think of the prominence of *kein* as a beginning word of many poems. ⁴¹ *Kein* brings up *nicht*, *nichts* and *nie* and demands that we consider the opposite, *alle*, which in half a dozen cases is used to create a great space around the poem by a sort of sweeping, magic gesture. And all instances recall that the study of first lines only serves to emphasize the importance of concluding lines.

We find that the use of *es* in opening lines signifies more than the mere frequency of the impersonal in German, as in "Es war ein König in Thule" or Heine's "Es fällt ein Stern herunter." When Rilke writes "Es winkt zu Fühlung fast aus allen Dingen," ⁴² this is a part of himself, a conscious part even. Malte's *Aufzeichnungen* begin: "So, also hierher kommen die Leute, um zu leben, ich würde eher meinen, es stürbe sich hier." ⁴³ How revealing then these diary entries are: "Um sie (die Gefühle) zu bezeichnen, sagst du: ich bin . . . , nein, ich glaube, du sagst vielmehr: es ist . . . es ist z. B. ein Abend in einer Stube" ⁴⁴ and from this point Rilke spins out a long plot. And "immer öfter geschieht es mir, dass ich nicht sagen kann: ich bin, . . . sondern, dass ich sagen muss: es ist. . . ." ⁴⁵

A first line is not a superficial façade but part of the inmost structure. ("Es gibt nichts Unwichtiges, nichts Unfestliches da. Jedes Wort, das mitgehen darf im Triumphzug des Verses, muss schreiten, und das Kleinste darf dem Grössten nicht nachstehen an äusserer Würde und Schönheit.") ⁴⁶ Rilke's awareness of the weight of the opening line becomes evident when he writes: "Ich habe nur

³⁹ Letter of 18. Oct. 1900 (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 54).

⁴⁰ "Ist ein Schloss. Das vergehende" is the first line of the poem in *Frühe Gedichte* (Werke I, 287) where the quoted line occurs.

⁴¹ E. g., II, 45: "Die Aschanti" (*B. d. B., I. Buch, II. Teil*); "Klage um Antinous" (*Neue Ged., And. Teil*) III, 125.

⁴² III, 452 (*Letzte Ged. u. Fragm.*)

⁴³ v, 7.

⁴⁴ *Tagebücher*, 3. Nov. 1899 (*Briefe u. Tageb. 1899-1902*, p. 204).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 205 Cf. *Requiem für eine Freundin* (Paula Becker-Moder-sonn): "nicht: das bin ich; nein: dies ist" (II, 326).

⁴⁶ Letter to Axel Junker, 7. Nov. 1901. (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 115.) Cf. also *Frühe Ged.* I, 260.

eines mitgelebt am ganzen Abend, das war das Goethe-Gedicht mit dem grossen geheimnisvollen Anfang."⁴⁷

By selected examples we have attempted to see whether, out of manifold forms, something like a fundamental compositional principle can be derived, whether opening lines provide a useful vehicle of interpretation, in other words: a hermeneutic principle. The answer is not certain, but the indications are that such a study moves us a step forward toward the discovery of such a principle in Rilke's lyricism.

Certain it is that the opening line had functional significance for Rilke. It is so pregnant a part of his poetry that through it he increases the inner resiliency. The opening line is like an iron rim around a bursting content. It is a line as important for Rilke's sense of form, for his "conciseness, economy, force, mass" as the heavy outlines Giotto put about the figures in his frescoes.

HERMAN SALINGER

The University of Wisconsin

RILKE—RODIN: A CORRECTION

The details of R. M. Rilke's life are well known and have been presented in a number of books, but there is one fact usually reported about Rilke's relationship to the French sculptor Auguste Rodin which needs correcting; i. e., the assertion that Rilke was Rodin's secretary.¹ Statements to that effect appeared even in Rilke's life-time. He called them 'obstinate legends' and tried to correct them himself. In a letter to Dr. A. Schaer, published in R. M. Rilke, *Briefe aus Muzot*, Insel, 1936, he writes: "Dass ich Rodins Sekretär gewesen sei, ist nicht viel mehr als eine hartnäckige Legende, erwachsen aus dem Umstande, dass ich ihm einmal, vorübergehend, während 5 Monaten(!), in seiner Kor-

⁴⁷ *Tagebücher*, 10. Sept. 1900 (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 289).

Rilke refers to: "So lässt mich scheinen, bis ich werde . . ."

¹ Cf. *Historical Survey of German Literature* by Sol Liptzin, Prentice-Hall, 1936, p. 207; *Deutsche Dichtung unserer Zeit* by Ernst Rose, Prentice-Hall, 1930, p. 222; *George, Hoffmannsthal, Rilke* by Martin Sommerfeld, New York, W. W. Norton, 1940, p. 29; *Rainer Maria Rilke* by Katharina Kippenberg, Leipzig, Insel, 1938, p. 142; *R. M. Rilke* by E. M. Butler, Cambridge Un. Press, 1941, p. 160.

respondenz behilflich war. . . . Aber sein Schüler bin ich viel besser und viel länger gewesen" (p. 246).

There is good reason why Rilke disliked being called Rodin's secretary. The term secretary denotes a relationship which Rilke resented, for even when he first met Rodin, at the age of 27, he felt that he was a master in his own right. Being an artist he naturally admired Rodin's work and was attracted by the personality of the great sculptor. Thus he became in more than one sense Rodin's pupil.

Perhaps the greatest single idea which Rilke owes to Rodin—he learned it more by watching the master at work than by talking to him—is that work, hard and patient work, is the secret of all great art. 'Il faut travailler, toujours travailler' was Rodin's credo as he expressed it in *Les Cathédrales de France*, and again 'le travail est mystérieux. Il accorde beaucoup aux patients et aux simples, il refuse aux pressés et aux vaniteux.'

From that time on we find in Rilke's own work a much greater awareness of the value of workmanship than he had before he met Rodin. In the *Requiem* he severely condemns those poets—like himself in his earlier work—who only pour out their feelings and changing moods, who think they must write a poem about everything that arouses their joy or sadness, instead of:

hart sich in die Worte zu verwandeln,
wie sich der Steinmetz einer Kathedrale
verbissen umsetzt in des Steines Gleichmut.

In a letter to E. Verhaeren whom he also knew in Paris and whom he much admired, Rilke talks of 'cette impitoyable évocation au travail qui nuit et jour réclame notre amour' (March 22, 1907). And, finally, in a letter to Rodin he compares the writing of prose to the building of a cathedral, 'la prose veut être bâtie comme une cathédrale.'² All these are pictures and ideas which clearly show Rodin's influence. They strengthen Rilke's claim that he was Rodin's pupil rather than his secretary. As a pupil he revered the old master and tried to help him, no doubt, with any odd job the latter wanted him to do. But this still does not make him Rodin's secretary. It is a small point, to be sure, but it brings a false note into a very human relationship.

H. F. PETERS

Reed College

² Dec. 29, 1908.

NORMAN HISTORY IN THE "LAY OF THE BEACH"

(Strandar ljóð)

In the Old-Norwegian *Strengleikar*,¹ thirteenth-century translation of a lost French or Anglo-French manuscript miscellany of so-called Breton lays, made by an unknown cleric in the service of Hákon Hákonsson, king of Norway from 1217 to 1263, the "Lay of Gurun" (*Guruns ljóð*) and the "Lay of the Beach" (*Strandar ljóð*) are of special importance and interest to students of the Breton lay² and of Old-Norwegian literature on several counts. First

¹ In J. R. Keyser and C. R. Unger, edd., *Strengleikar eða Ljóðabók—En Samling af romantiske Fortællinger efter bretonske Folkesange (Lais), oversat fra Fransk paa Norsk ved Midten af trettende Aarhundrede efter Foranstaltning af Kong Haakon Haakonsøn* (Oslo, 1850), where *Guruns ljóð* ("Lay of Gurun") is No. xi (pp. 57-61; Notes, p. 114), *Strandar ljóð* ("Lay of the Beach") is No. xiv (pp. 67-8; Notes, pp. 118-9). There is a Norwegian translation by Henrik Winter-Hjelm, *Strenglege eller Sangenes Bog, oversat fra Oldnorsk* (Oslo, 1850), pp. 100-07 ("Guruns Sang"), pp. 118-20 ("Strandens Sang"). Some of this material is apparently translated into French by Mathieu Auguste Geffroy, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits concernant l'histoire ou la littérature de la France qui sont conservés dans les bibliothèques ou archives de Suède, Danemark et Norvège* (Paris, 1855-6), though at the time of writing I have not been able to examine this work; there is, it may be noted, a French translation of the fragmentary beginning of *Leikara ljóð* (ed. cit., p. 68), together with some interesting comment, in *Revue celtique* xxviii (1898), 328-9. The promise of a complete German translation of the *Strengleikar*, made by Karl Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France* ("Bibliotheca Normannica," Vol. III, 2d ed., Halle, 1900), p. xxxix, n. 1, does not appear to have been fulfilled; at any rate, the promise is withdrawn in Warnke's 3d ed. (Halle, 1925), pp. lxi-ii. There is an outline of the "Lay of Gurun" and of the "Lay of the Beach" in Axel Ahlström, *Studier i den fornfranska Lais-Litteraturen* (Uppsala, 1892), pp. 154-5, and in H. G. Leach, *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), pp. 218-22; briefer outlines in Warnke, 3d ed., p. xxviii. For translations of the "Foreword," "Lay of Gurun," "Lay of the Beach of Barfleur," and "Ricar the Old" see H. M. Smyser and F. P. Magoun, Jr., *Survivals in Old Norwegian from Medieval English, French and German Literature, together with the Latin versions of the Heroic Legend of Walter of Aquitaine* (Connecticut College Monograph No. 1) (Baltimore; Waverly Press, 1941), pp. 38-49.

² In general see Warnke, 3d ed., Introduction; also Ernst Hoepffner, *Les Lais de Marie de France*, Paris, 1935.

and foremost, the French texts, of whose one-time existence there can be no reasonable doubt,³ are lost and are only represented in the *Strengleikar*; today these Norwegian translations must thus serve as originals. In the second place, these two lays are unusual in that both appear to be composed around historical events⁴ rather than around a folktale or love-story.⁵ Thirdly, not only are they not Breton in their geographical and historical setting but, judged by their narratives, are clearly in *fons et origo* essentially Scottish and Norman respectively. Finally, the *Strengleikar* constitute a significant element in the corpus of Old-Norwegian translation-literature, especially because they include lays that appear no longer to survive in French,⁶ a feature that puts this work in a class with *Þiðreks*

³ I translate here from the Norwegian's Foreword (*ed. cit.*, *Forræða*, p. 1, ll. 19-25): "And this book, which the worshipful King Hákon caused to be translated into Norwegian from French, can be called a "Book of Lays" (*Ljóða bók*), for from those stories which this book reveals, the poets in More Southern Britain [i. e. Brittany], which is in France, composed songs in verse which are performed on harps, rotes, drums, wind instruments, tamburines, psaltries, and "choruses" and all kinds of stringed instruments which men make for themselves and for others for secular diversion." There can be little doubt that the Norwegian translator is here referring to a single French manuscript; see Rudolf Meissner, *Die Strengleikar: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. altnordisch. Prosalitteratur* (Halle, 1902), p. 199. That this lost French manuscript stood in certain respects in close relationship to British Museum, *Ms. Harley 978* has been pointed out by Warnke, pp. lxi-ii (abbreviated "H") and, with certain modifications, by Meissner, *op. cit.*, p. 200; the only other big lay miscellany is Warnke's "S" (pp. lx-xi), Bibliothèque nationale, *Ms. nouv. acq. franç. 1104*. See also Ezio Levi, *Maria di Francia: Eliduc* (Florence, 1924), pp. lxxxv-vi and lxxxii.

⁴ Thus inviting a certain comparison with the *Lai d'Havelok*; see W. W. Skeat—Kenneth Sisam, *The Lay of Havelok the Dane* (2d ed., Oxford, 1915 and later printings), pp. xii-xv, xxv-vi, and Ferd. Holthausen, *Havelok* (3d ed., Heidelberg, 1928), pp. xiii-iv. Here, however, the history, if not quite "no history at all" (so Sisam, p. xxvi), is apparently vastly more altered than in the "Lay of the Beach" or even in the "Lay of Gurun."

⁵ Cp. Hoepfner, *op. cit.*, pp. 166 ff.; Warnke, p. lii (quoting Foulet).

⁶ Apart from *Guruns ljóð* and *Strandar ljóð* there are two other quite fragmentarily preserved lays not represented in French: *Ricar hinn gamli* (*ed. cit.*, pp. 82-3) with the familiar elements of the *vieux jaloux* and the *mal mariée*, and another (pp. 84-9), whose setting is near Piacenza (Italy); without manuscript title one might think of this latter as a second *Tveggja Elskanda ljóð* (cp. p. 89, 20) or even as *Snjófalls ljóð* (cp. p. 88, 17); see

saga,⁷ *Tristrams saga ok Isondar*,⁸ and finally with *Landres þáttur* in *Karlamagnús saga* which preserves an otherwise lost Middle-English romance that might be entitled *Olive and Landres*.⁹

The "Lay of the Beach," offering a simpler and hence more compactly presentable historical problem of the two, will be discussed here.¹⁰ Its text is not, properly speaking, that of a lay; it tells us, rather, of the circumstances under which an unpreserved lay of this title came to be composed and furnishes us with quite precise indications of its immediate *mise en scène*: Barfleur (département de la Manche), near Cherbourg on the north coast of the Norman peninsula. The text is so short that a complete translation may well be given.

THE LAY OF THE BEACH

Now after this¹¹ it is fitting for us to set forth that which is called the "Lay of the Beach," (explain) how it begins.

King William, who attacked England, caused this lay to be composed. When he had got everything under his control and had put sentries in charge of the Border, then he went back and boarded a ship at Southampton

further Ernst Brugger, *Zs. f. franz. Spr. u. Litteratur* XLIX (1926-7), 474-5. For discussion and brief outlines see Ahlström, *op. cit.*, p. 156 ("Ricar") and Leach, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-4.

⁷ Notably, *inter alia*, for its preservation of portions of an otherwise lost state of the *Nibelungenlied*; see Andreas Heusler, *Nibelungensage u. Nibelungenlied* (3d ed., Dortmund, 1929), *passim*, and Mary Thorp, *The Study of the Nibelungenlied, being the History of the Study of the Epic and Legend from 1755 to 1937* (Oxford, 1940), pp. 70 ff., 92 ff. For a translation of the passage corresponding to the *Nibelunge Nôt* see Smyser-Magoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 ff.

⁸ Cp. Wolfgang Golther, *Tristan u. Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters u. der neuen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 182 ff., esp. p. 183, n. 1.

⁹ See H. M. Smyser, "The Middle-English and Old Norse Story of Olive," *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 69-84. For a translation of this text see Smyser-Magoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-27.

¹⁰ The "Lay of Gurun," giving apparently a romantically confused picture of Scottish history between the years 1107-18 (in the reign of Alexander I), is the subject of a forthcoming paper in *Studia Neophilologica*.

¹¹ By "after this" (*þessu nest*, 67, 8) is meant the immediately preceding lay, *Geita(r)lauf*, "honeysuckle" or "woodbine" (Marie's *Chievrefueil*, Warnke, 3d ed., pp. 181 ff.).

(Ha.), because he had learned that almost all landed men who owned castles within the boundary of Normandy were in revolt against him and were assailing his rule. So he turned his wrath against them and gathered a great host against them and a numerous army from his lands. When he came to Normandy, he besieged and destroyed their castles and rebuilt [them] as best pleased him and attacked them all and thoroughly pacified all his kingdom and gave merited punishment to those who had been bad and had broken the peace. When he had stayed some little time in his domain, then he was again eager to journey across the English Channel and went to the town of Barfleur and stayed there a very long time. And he went every day with goshawks and hunted cranes and caught a great number. And he remained there a very long time waiting for a favorable wind, and a great fleet was assembled there to transport his army. And the king was unwilling to accept the advice of the captains and hurry out into unsettled weather; on the contrary, he stayed on there a very long time on account of the diversion, which pleased him so well and delighted him greatly.

Then he reflected with due consideration that he would dispatch his emissaries with a letter into Brittany to that Red Lady who knew the nature of all lays and had always engaged in this kind of entertainment and had taken great pains about it from her childhood, (the message being to the effect) that she should compose for him a new lay with the fairest melody that her versatile knowledge could devise and to send it quickly to him by these emissaries who brought this message to her, "and it is to be called the 'Lay of the Beach.'" By this lay he wishes to remember, and always to be reminded of, that entertaining sojourn which he made on the beach of Barfleur, waiting for a favorable wind.

Then he sent into Brittany all the best harpers who were with him and with them rich gifts and offerings of royal liberality. When they had come to her in Brittany, bringing her rich offerings of the king's generosity, she received these with great pleasure and many thanks. Then there elapsed a brief interval of time. Then she composed the lay which the king had requested of her through his letter and emissaries and instructed the harpers and taught them the "Lay of the Beach." When they came back to the king with great joy and pleasant merriment because they had well and quickly executed everything that they had desired, they then had to perform the lay in the presence of the king and his favorites and courtiers. And those who were connoisseurs said that they had never before heard so good a lay as this. And since the king claimed to prefer this especially to all lays, accordingly no harper or minstrel pretends to be competent unless he knows how to perform this well and perfectly. And this [lay] went the rounds of all the courts of kings and dukes and nobles. And there was no consort of duke or earl, or other great ladies, who did not claim to be pleased with that lay. And even in our days there are many who call this the favorite lay and [worthiest] of a king's entertainment.

Now I have read no further in the French language about this lay and I shall add absolutely nothing except that may God bless, honor, keep, and

dignify the king who had this book translated into Norwegian as a delightful diversion for the present generation and for the one to come. And may He show mercy to him who wrote this. Amen.

The actual composition of this reputedly beautiful and popular lay is attributed to a certain Red Lady of Brittany, but the Norman subject and the Norman scene are prescribed for her by William, Duke of Normandy and Conqueror and King of England. The main narrative hinges on an episode, evidently historical, namely, one of the several journeys made by William from England to the Continent in the years following 1072, quite likely that of the year 1073, when he put down the serious revolt of Maine, adjoined province south of Normandy. At the outset much is made of his getting everything under his control and of his posting sentinels on the "border" (*lanndamære*, 67, 11), evidently the Scottish Border, and this would seem almost certainly to refer to his vigorous and successful campaign late in 1072 into Scotland, at the end of which he received homage from Malcolm III at the little town of Abernethy (Perthshire).¹² In 1073, after having settled affairs north of the Border, William set out at once for the Continent and suppressed the revolt of Maine, as mentioned above. The lay, it is true, speaks of revolt as occurring in Normandy not in Maine, but in 1063 William had effected the important conquest of Maine¹³ and, consequently, Maine may naturally enough have been regarded as part of Normandy by the author of the lay. The revolt of Maine in 1073¹⁴ had been a serious affair and was especially noteworthy on account of William's use of large numbers of English soldiery,¹⁵ a feature of this campaign almost surely reflected in the remarks in the lay about a "numerous army from his lands" (*fjølmennelegan her ór lönndum sínum*, 67, 15) and a "great fleet" (*mikill skipafjölde*, 67, 23) necessary to transport it back home. The "beach," that of the once important Channel port of Barfleur (dép. Manche), 25 km. due E of Cherbourg, is not mentioned by contemporary historians in the present connection, but there is no special reason to doubt that this was the point of embarkation for the return journey. The long, very long, sojourn at Barfleur may

¹² Ed. A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes* (rev. American ed., Oxford, 1873), IV, 349-52.

¹³ *Ibid.*, III, 135 ff., esp. pp. 143-44.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 369 ff.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, 378 and note 5.

likewise well be historical, unless by chance this much stressed feature of the story has been colored by, or somehow confused with, the very famous and exceedingly vexatious delay suffered by William as a result of adverse winds during August and September 1066 when he was waiting, first at Dives-Cabourg (dép. Calvados), later at St.-Valéry (dép. Somme), to set sail for his conquest of England.¹⁶

It is perhaps impossible to prove absolutely that the expedition of 1073 against Maine furnishes the background of the "Lay of the Beach," but it strikes me as considerably more likely than any of the several other journeys which William made to the Continent. For example, the journey of 1072 to Normandy, though obscure in many respects,¹⁷ does not seem to have involved the type of military action implied in the lay, nor had, at that time, the pacification of the north of Britain just been effected as the lay implies. In 1076 William laid ineffective siege to Dol (dép. Ille-et-Vilaine) in Brittany,¹⁸ an action clearly not reflected in the lay. In 1077 William made a short-lived peace with the king of France but soon was faced by the open rebellion of his eldest son Robert. The strife involved was long drawn out,¹⁹ occurred several years after the settling of the situation on the Border in 1072,²⁰ and did not involve the transport on any important scale of English troops to France.

Taking it all in all, I see no good reason for doubting that the "Lay of the Beach" reflects rather closely William's campaign against Maine in 1073, heavily supported by an English army.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

THE BURDEN IN CAROLS

"The burden," says Dr. Greene in his *Early English Carols*,¹ "makes and marks the carol. The presence of an invariable line or group of lines which is to be sung before the first stanza and after

¹⁶ Cp. Freeman, III, 257-65.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, IV, 431-33.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 367-68.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, esp. pp. 433-41.

²⁰ Indeed, Robert actually aided William in his second campaign against Malcolm during a brief period of reconciliation between father and son in 1080 (Freeman, IV, 441).

¹ Oxford 1935; p. cxxxiii.

all stanzas is a feature which distinguishes the carol from all other forms of Middle English lyric." MS evidence for the repetition of the burden after every stanza is found in over a hundred texts where the first few words are written out following each stanza.² Tabulation of the texts in this indispensable volume shows that 72% of the burdens consist of two short lines; this was probably the original form.³ Only eighteen burdens have one line,⁴ and of the longer burdens Dr. Greene computes "111 in all, including those in which the burden is a couplet repeated."⁵

The following notes will clear up, I hope, a few difficulties, mainly editorial, presented by the burdens of carols in B. M. MS Additional 5665, a collection of religious and secular songs. The "Ritson MS," as it is generally called, was designed for use by a sophisticated group able to read music—incidentally the songs are written on verso and following recto so that they could be sung without turning the page. This music, however, sets no standard for the popular performance of carols, essentially a non-learned *genre*. The words of most of the burdens of the carols in this MS appear twice, first with music for two parts and then again with music for three parts. Only two carols lack this repeated burden at the head.⁶ In twenty-nine carols the burden is a couplet repeated.⁷ In these cases, Dr. Greene scrupulously follows the MS and prints the burden as a single four-line unit, apparently assuming that the couplet is to be sung twice over—this is implicit in his remark, nowhere further elucidated, that "the burden is a couplet repeated." This procedure is confusing for two reasons. From a musical standpoint, the repetition of words alone has no significance.⁸ From a literary standpoint, the essential simple carol-form

² Indicated in the various footnotes in Greene; 116 texts in all, including 27 from Balliol 354; 17 from Kele; and 9 from BM Addit. 5465. The burden is written in full after at least one stanza (indicated in others by a few words) in Nos. 322A, 426a and 461.

³ See "The Earliest Carols," *MLN.*, LIII, 239-45.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. cxxxviii.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. cxxxviii, footnote 3.

⁶ Greene No. 307 (three parts only); 96 (two parts only; "*Te Eternum*" is a 'faburdon').

⁷ Greene Nos. 31, 57, 58, 59, 85, 89, 91, 99, 103, 109, 110, 111, 116, 118, 131, 133, 186, 259, 277, 306, 330, 337c, 348, 354, 359B, 367, 375, 387, 435.

⁸ Fehr in *Archiv* cvi notes the number of parts or voices for each line

of couplet burden (and in some cases quatrain stanzas) is complicated without warrant. A more plausible view is that the two arrangements are alternative, that is, one or the other to be sung, according to the occasion or the ability of the performers, but never to be sung concurrently.

Disregard of the musical indications and of established stanzaic arrangement leads to a serious misinterpretation of the form of No. 59 in the *Early English Carols*, which Dr. Greene prints as two six-line tail-rime stanzas with a four-line burden. My arrangement, following the MS, restores the typical two-line burden (BB) and the common carol quatrain (aaab), and gives a further example of a burden written out in full after a stanza.⁹ It has frequently been suggested that the rime of refrain lines, when the same as the burden, served as a signal for the singing of the burden.¹⁰ Such a view is amply supported by the music of this carol, and of others in the Ritson MS. Here the refrain has the same music, as well as the same words, as the first half of the burden; and the music for the burden repeated after the first stanza is the same as that for the burden at the head.¹¹ I restore the quatrain rime scheme by supplying 'word,' an insertion which is not opposed by the music.¹² It should be noted that the second

by the symbols *a*, *b*, *c*. The editing of Elizabethan madrigals presents a similar problem, where often each part has its own words written in full; the duty of the editor is not to reproduce the strings of words but to present a literary form. Greene notes the music for one text on p. lviii. I would accept a date earlier than the first quarter of the xvi century for this collection of carols; the handwriting of the Latin note on f. 61^a (dated 1510) is later than that of the carols.

⁹ In the same way, I take Greene No. 6 to be a quatrain type (aaab) with a single 'Nowell' as the refrain: this is the way stanzas 2 and 3 are written. In the arrangement of the first stanza (written under the music), the following 'Nowells' are in two groups of four, the first with music for two parts and the second with music for three parts. The two part music is precisely the same as that for the 'Nowell nowell nowell nowell' line of the head burden; and it may be that the 'Nowells' following the stanza indicate the repetition of the burden. The refrain 'Nowell' is written on the last line of f. 9^a, and repeated for convenience of singing (the music is the same) at the head of f. 9^b—this would help avoid any interruption in the musical performance.

¹⁰ So Greene, *op. cit.*, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

¹¹ Very slight variations in the music for the first three words. See also Greene Nos. 91A, 103e, 330, 337c, 367, 387.

¹² Assumption of scribal error is justified by slips in other texts in this

stanza, written without music at the bottom of f. 52^b, has three riming lines bracketed by the refrain at the side. Here, then, is my corrected version:

BM Addit. 5665

f. 52^b

Blessed mote þu be swete ihūs
qui hodie natus es nobis

By thi burthe þu blessed lord
ys made of variaunce now on acorde
therfor we may shyng this [word]
Blessed mote þu be swete ihūs

f. 53^a

Blessed mote þu be swete ihus
Qui hodie [natus es nobis]

Vpon this heygh blessed day
Ihū in hys moderes armys lay
Wherfor to hym lete *vus* all say
Blessed mote þu be swete ihūs
[Blessed mote þu be swete ihūs
qui hodie natus es nobis]

f. 52^b

Smert

In the same way the burden of Greene's No. 367 is written out in full in the MS after the first stanza, a quatrain; there is no need to postulate a repeated couplet burden. In No. 464, a three-part carol in another Tudor songbook, the "Fairfax MS" (BM Addit. 5465), Dr. Greene prints the four-line burden three times, making a twelve-line burden. The two other voices are given the burden only once, and again it seems that this presentation is not only non-popular but possibly unique. In other MSS where the words of the burden are written in full for several parts, Dr. Greene naturally prints the single form.¹³ By removing carols with repeated burdens from the total of 111, the number is reduced to about seventy texts with burdens of over two lines, a number which indeed gives far more support to Dr. Greene's own thesis; for we can now state that 81% of all carols have burdens of two short lines.

MS. Greene No. 118, st. 1, v. 3 "Whe founde" is written under the line; st. 2, v. 2 "virginite" is not cancelled as it needs to be. Greene No. 57 has exactly the same form as this text—single 2-line burden and two quatrains—and here the words of the first line are "hopelessly corrupt."

¹³ Greene Nos. 144, 150D, 437, 448, 463, 465, 466. There are two carols with repeated couplet burdens in Arch. Selden B. 26—Nos. 18b and 33.

A slight emendation brings another carol (No. 323) into the regular quatrain with refrain type in all its stanzas. In the first stanza it is evident that the scribe has written the refrain as the first instead of the fourth line. A similar slip in the following carol in the same MS, where the rime word is shifted from its proper position,¹⁴ gives further justification for this correction of the scribe's carelessness. I read the first quatrain of No. 323, therefore, as follows:

Porkington 10

f. 198^a

Mett y whyte Ihū to chyrcheward gone
 Petur and Pawle thomas & Ihon
 And hys descyplys Euery-chone
 And By a chapell as y Came

The pointing of the burden by typographical devices is convenient for indicating carol form. On the other hand, we should beware of printing in this manner of burden and quatrain what is in an altogether different literary form. "When Fortune list" was accurately described by Carleton Brown twenty years ago as a rondel;¹⁵ but in his later *Religious Lyrics of the XV Century*¹⁶ it appears without such mention, and moreover arranged as a carol with burden (in smaller type) and quatrains. Rondels are of such rare occurrence in Middle English verse that it is too bad that Dr. Brown did not bring out this unusual form more clearly: apart from the 102 rondels by Charles d'Orleans (all of which, however, are translations or imitations from his own French) there are only twelve Middle English rondels, including four by Chaucer and four by Hoccleve.¹⁷ "When Fortune list" provides an inter-

¹⁴ Greene No. 124, st. 9, v. 3 (f. 199^b): "þer yn to wonny þer yn to dwell." The Porkington MSS are now on permanent loan to the National Library of Wales. Compare also "As I cowthe walke etc." printed by Brown, *MLN.*, XXXIII, 415-7, st. 1, vv. 6, 7 transposed with consequent destruction of rime scheme.

¹⁵ *A Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse*, Oxford 1916, 1920, II. No. 2527.

¹⁶ Oxford 1939, pp. 259-60.

¹⁷ Rondels in Middle English:

(A) Associated with Charles d'Orleans:

(1) to (8) in the Grenoble and Paris (Bibl. nat. fr. 25458) MSS; ed. MacCracken, *PMLA.*, xxvi; (9) and (10) in Royal 16 F ii prob-

esting contrast to the foregoing carol (Greene's No. 59); in both the length is fourteen lines, but in the rondel the two refrain lines (AB) are not outside and detachable but an integral part of the stanza:

Cambridge University Ff 1 6

f. 53^b

When fortune list yewe here assent
 What is too deme þat may be doo
 There schapeth nought from her entent
 ffor as sche will it goth ther to
 All passith by her iugement
 The hy astate the pore all-so
 When ffortune [list yewe here assent
 [What is too deme þat may be doo]
 To lyve in ioy out of turment
 Seyng the worlde goth too and fro
 Thus is my schort aviseament
 As hyt comyth so lete it go
 When ffortune [list yewe here assent
 [What is too deme þat may be doo]

ably by the Duke of Suffolk; *loc. cit.*, pp. 178-9; (11) to (102) ninety-one items in Harley 682, *ed. Roxburghe Club*, pp. 137-90.

(B) Chaucer:

(1) to (3) 'Merciles Beaute,' a triad of rondels in Pepys 2006, p. 390 (xvii century transcript in BM Addit. 38179, II, f. 51^a; printed frequently; (4) "Now welcome somer with thy sonne softe," inserted in two MSS of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules* between st. 97 and 98; printed very frequently.

(C) Hoccleve:

(5) "Somer þat rypest mannes sustenance," Huntington HM 111, f. 39^b; printed often, *e. g.*, *EETS*. lxi, 60; (6) to (8) Three double rondels in Huntington HM 744, ff. 53^a-54^b: "Wel may I pleyne on yow Lady Moneye," "Hoccleue I wole it to thee knowen be," and "Of my lady wel me reioise I may"; printed *Academy* 1892, I, 542; Gollancz, *EETS*. lxxiii, 35-8; Hammond, *Eng. Verse*, p. 68.

(D) Others:

(9) "Sovereigne lord welcome to your citee," inserted in Lydgate's verse account of Henry VI's entry into London in MSS Cotton Cleop. C iv, f. 38^a; Cotton Julius B ii, f. 89^b; Harley 565, f. 114^b; London Guildhall 3133, f. 132^b; Longleat. The rondel only is printed by Schleich, *Archiv*. xcvi, 191-4; Cohen, *Lyric Forms from France*, p. 69; Ellis, *Fabyan's Chronicle* 1811, p. 604; (10) "When Fortune list yewe here assent," discussed here; (11) "Fresshest of colour and most amyable," Trinity Coll. Cambridge 600, p. 373; unpublished; (12) "Rejoise ye reames of Englund and of Fraunce," Harley 7333, f. 32^b; printed Wright, *Pol. Poems*, II, 140; Ritson, *Anc. Songs* 1829, I, 128; Guest, *Hist. English Rhythms*, p. 646; MacCracken, *EETS*. 192, 622.

"There blows a colde wynde todaye" is treated by Dr. Greene as a carol (No. 170). In spite of the fact, as Dr. Greene points out to me, that the first four lines are unbracketed and without the stanza sign (the common indication of the burden) I prefer to regard the first four lines in this instance as the first stanza. The form (even the refrain "To kepe the cold wynd awaye") is identical with that of the other stanzas, and the sense is improved.¹⁸

To offset the loss of this text to the corpus of carols I add the following new carols not mentioned by Dr. Greene or his reviewers:

(1) Gabriell off hye degre

Hunterian MS 83, f. iii^b—six stanzas only and burden '*Noua noua / Aue fit ex Eua.*' With music. A variant text of Greene No. 238. Not published.

(2) All heyle Mary and well þou be

Hunterian MS 83, f. 21^a—five quatrains and burden '*Salve sancta parens.*' With music. Not published.

(3) It fell ageyns the next nyght

Royal 19 B iv, f. 97^b—six quatrains and burden '*Pax uobis quod the Fox / For I am comyn to toowne.*' Not published.

(4) Our shyp is launched from the grounde

Trinity College Dublin MS 516, f. 30^a—twenty quatrains and burden '*Stere welle the good shype / god be our gyde.*' Printed by Madden, *Archaeologia* XXIX, 326-30. Dr. Greene informs me that he did not accept this as a carol until after his book was at press.

(5) O lord so swett ser Iohn dothe kys

Huntington MS EL 1160, f. 11^a—five quatrains and burden '*hey noyney I wyll loue our ser Iohn / & I loue eny.*' I am indebted to Dr. Herbert C. Schulz of the Henry E. Huntington Library for information on this and the following carol. Not published.

(6) I must go walke þe woed so wyld

Huntington MS EL 1160, f. 11^b—four 5-line stanzas: the burden is lacking. Not published.

(7) Galawnt pride thy father ys dede

Bodleian 14528 (Rawlinson poet. 34), f. 4^b—ten quatrains and burden (repeated again at end) '*Huff a galawnt vylabele / Thus syngyth galawntes in here revele.*' Printed by Furnivall, *The Academy*, Aug. 29, 1896.

ROSSELL HOPE ROBBINS

New York

¹⁸ See further Greene, *ELH.*, VII, 226 on No. 142.

In the same way there is no support for printing in carol form "What why dedist þou wynk whan þou a wyf toke" (Bodl. 29734) in *Percy Soc.* XXIII, 35; it consists of four quatrains. Not included by Greene.

JOHN GOWER AND THE *DE GENEALOGIA DEORUM*

Speculations as to the possibility of John Gower's having used Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* in the composition of his *Confessio Amantis* presuppose that, although there are no indications that Gower himself visited Italy, he might well have encountered the manuscript of Boccaccio's compendium¹ in the hands of some friend returning from abroad.

Mr. G. C. Macaulay, in his edition of the *Confessio Amantis*, has indicated the following pieces of evidence as suggesting a connection between Gower's work and Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum*: the seemingly unparalleled confusion of the Graiae with the Gorgons;² the similarity of the images used by both writers in the story of Narcissus;³ the awareness of the separate identities of Brexeida and Criseida;⁴ and the story that it was of the slaying of Phocus that Peleus was purified by Achastus.⁵ Of these, the last two are found in so many other works that they are insignificant as evidence of a connection between Gower and Boccaccio's handbook. Incidentally, in the story of Narcissus, both Gower and Boccaccio refer to the *pity* of the nymphs, whereas only their *grief* is mentioned in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*⁶ and in the *Ovide Moralisé*.⁷

In addition to the points of similarity referred to by Mr. Macaulay, I have found several resemblances that seem significant.

¹ Of the thirty or forty extant apographs dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the first was apparently made in 1370 or early in 1371. See Ernest H. Wilkins, *Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature*, Chicago, 1923, p. 315, and *The University of Chicago Manuscript of the Genealogia deorum gentilium of Boccaccio*, Chicago, 1927, pp. 4-5.

² *De Genealogia Deorum*, 1511 (in Latin), x 10, and *Confessio Amantis*, in *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, Oxford, Vol. II, 1901, I 405 ff. See Macaulay, II 468 (note on I 389).

³ *De Gen.* VII 59, and *Conf.* I 2316-7. See Macaulay, II 475 (note on I 2316 f.).

⁴ *De Gen.* XII 52, and *Conf.* II 2455-6. See Macaulay, II 489 (note on II 2451 ff.).

⁵ *De Gen.* XII 50, and *Conf.* III 2551-7. See Macaulay, II 500 (note on III 2555).

⁶ *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon*, ed. Hugo Magnus, Berlin, 1914, III 505-6.

⁷ *Ovide Moralisé*, ed. C. de Boer, Tome I, Amsterdam, 1915, III 1834.

In his note upon Gower's use of the name "Namplus," Mr. Macaulay comments,⁸ "it would seem that our author had before him also some other form of the story, where he found the name 'Nauplius,' or 'Nauplus,' which he read 'Nanplus' or 'Namplus.'" The *De Genealogia Deorum*⁹ uses the suggested form, "Nauplius," and thus is a possible source, as are also Hyginus¹⁰ and Apollodorus.¹¹ But in Constans' ed. of the *Roman de Troie* one MS reads 'Namplus.'

The story of Demophon and Phillis, Mr. Macaulay states,¹² is "Partly from Ovid . . . but there was probably some other source, for our author would not find anything in Ovid about the transformation into a tree." Gower writes that Phillis

Was schape into a Notetre.¹³

In the *De Genealogia Deorum*, we find "in amigdalum . . . versa est."¹⁴ Of the other mythographers¹⁵ whom I have consulted, Servius¹⁶ alone gives the story in this form and was probably the source of Boccaccio's version. However, Gower gives no apparent indications of having had access to Servius and seems to have obtained the story through Boccaccio, since I have discovered no other channel of transmission.

In the story of Tantalus, Gower's phraseology and his concise though full treatment¹⁷ are much more similar to Boccaccio's¹⁸ than to the handling of the story by Ovid,¹⁹ Hyginus,²⁰ or Fulgentius,²¹ all of whom are mentioned by Mr. Macaulay as probable sources.

A more impressive correspondence between Boccaccio and Gower

⁸ *Op. cit.*, II 496 (note on III 973 ff.).

⁹ *De Gen.* II 25, x 59-60.

¹⁰ *Fabulae*, ed. Mauricius Schmidt, Jenae, 1872, cv i, cxvi, and *passim*.

¹¹ *Bibliotheca*, Loeb Classical Library, ed. Sir J. G. Frazer, 1921, II i 5, II vii 4, etc.

¹² *Op. cit.*, II 503 (note on IV 731 ff.). ¹³ *Conf.* IV 867. ¹⁴ *De Gen.* XI 25.

¹⁵ Hyginus, *op. cit.*, LIX: Apollodorus, *op. cit.*, vol. II, *Epitoma*, VI xvi; Filippo "Ceffi"'s Italian translation of the *Heroides*, ed. G. Bernardoni, *Epistole Eroiche di Ovidio Nasone*, Milano, 1842. Fulgentius, *Opera*, ed. John Conington, fourth edition, London, 1884; Albricus Philosophus, in *Mythographi Latini*, ed. Thomas Munckerus, Amsterdam, 1681; and the author of the *Ovide Moralisé* do not treat the story.

¹⁶ Servius, *Commentarii in Virgilium Serviani*, ed. H. Albertus Lion, Gottingae, 1826, Vol. II, on *Bucol.* v 10.

¹⁷ *Conf.* v 363 ff.

²⁰ *Fab.* LXXXII.

¹⁸ *De Gen.* XII 1.

²¹ *Opera*, II xv.

¹⁹ *Met.* IV 458 f.

appears in the story of Theseus and Ariadne, of which Mr. Macaulay writes,²² "The outline of this story might have been got from Ovid or from Hyginus, *Fab.* 40-43, but several points of detail suggest a different source . . . [as] the name of the island where Ariadne was deserted." Gower identifies the island as "Chyo,"²³ although Ovid,²⁴ Hyginus,²⁵ and Apollodorus²⁶ maintain it to be the island of Naxos or Dia,²⁷ names upon which the majority of Latin and Greek writers agree. Significantly, in the *De Genealogia Deorum*, we find "in Chium insulam: ut dicit Ovidius,"²⁸ a statement that seems to indicate that the manuscript of Ovid used by Boccaccio had "Chium" substituted for the usual "Naxon" or that Boccaccio misread the manuscript. We are led to believe Boccaccio's handbook or possibly the *Ovide Moralisé* to be the source of Gower's "Chyo."

It is worthy of note that, of the works which might have been Gower's sources for the particulars I have discussed, only the *Genealogia* contains all the parallels. In the light of these parallels, it seems extremely likely that Gower knew Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* and consulted it in the course of the composition of his *Confessio Amantis*. Such a likelihood is doubly significant in that it augments the possibility that Gower's acquaintance, Chaucer, also knew and used Boccaccio's compendium.²⁹

DOROTHY A. DILTS

Cambridge, Mass.

²² *Op. cit.*, III 503 (note to v 5231 ff.).

²³ *Conf.* v 5413.

²⁴ *Met.* XIII 636, 640, 649, 690; VIII 174-6.

²⁵ *Fab.* XXXXIII.

²⁶ *Epitoma*, I 9.

²⁷ The *Ovide Moralisé*, Fol. 173^c, has the name "Thie," according to S. B. Meech, *PMLA.*, 46, 1931, p. 200. However, de Boer's ed. has the reading "Chie." Albricus Philosophus and Fulgentius do not give the story. Filippo's translation of the *Heroides* does not name the island. Servius, *Georg.* I 222, identifies it as "Naxum insulam."

²⁸ *De Gen.* XI 29.

²⁹ C. G. Child, *MLN.*, 11, 1896, 475-490; W. W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Oxford, III, 1894, xxxiv, xxxix, xl; E. F. Shannon, *Chaucer and the Roman Poets*, Cambridge, 1929, 67, 72, 75, 96, 136, and *passim*; T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, New York, 1892, II 184, 232, 262; J. L. Lowes, *PMLA.*, 33, 1918, 323-4; and H. R. Patch, *MLN.*, 34, 1919, 327, and *On Rereading Chaucer*, 1939, 40. On the other hand see S. B. Meech, *PMLA.*, 46, 1931, 182 ff.

OBSERVATIONS ON DANTE AND THE
HOUS OF FAME

An interesting and heretofore almost unnoticed example of the workings of Chaucer's mind upon suggestions caught from another writer is found at the end of the first book of the *Hous of Fame* and at the beginning of the second, where the description of the eagle and of the dizzy ascent into the heavens runs closely parallel to passages in Dante's *Paradiso*¹ and in his *Purgatorio*.²

As Chaucer wrote that in his dream he turned his eyes to heaven and

faste be the sonne, as hye
As kenne myghte I with myn ye,
Me thoughte I sawgh an egle sore . . .³

his mind seems to have been dwelling upon Beatrice in the *Paradiso*, who is described as looking into the sun:

riguardar nel sole.⁴

There, too, as in Chaucer we find the eagle:

Aquila si non gli s'affisse unquanco.⁵

Chaucer's imagination then turned to the *Purgatorio*,⁶ as Mr. Skeat⁷ points out, and modelled his shining eagle upon the golden eagle that carried Dante aloft. Mr. Skeat notes that Chaucer's description is also somewhat similar to Dante's description of the descent of the angel, in an earlier canto of the same work.⁸ It may be worthy of note, in addition to these observations of Mr. Skeat, that Dante's figure of the herald bearing news after the description of the angel is suggestive of the motif of tidings so important in the *Hous of Fame*.

¹ *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri*, ed. G. A. Scartazzini, Milan, 1896. Professor H. R. Patch called my attention to the passages in the *Paradiso*, particularly I, 61-3.

² *Ibid.* Chaucer's probable debt to two passages is noted by W. W. Skeat, *Works of Chaucer*, III, 1894, 253 (note to I 500).

³ *Hous of Fame*, in *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, Boston and New York, 1933, I, 497-9, p. 336.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, I, 47-8.

⁷ W. W. Skeat, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, 17-24.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, IX, 19 ff.

The picture of Beatrice and Dante gazing upon the sun again seems to have dominated Chaucer's mind as he proceeded with his description of the eagle, using Dante's brilliant figure of speech:

never sawe men such a syghte,
But yf the heven had ywonne
Alle newe of gold another sonne . . .⁹

Dante had written (*Paradiso*):

E di subito parve giorno a giorno
essere aggiunto, come quei che puote
avesse il ciel d'un altro sole adorno.¹⁰

In the succeeding verses, Dante, like Chaucer, is lifted up¹¹ so fast that

ma folgore, fuggendo il proprio sito,
non corse, come tu che ad esso riedi.¹²

Strikingly similar is Chaucer's description of the downward and upward swoop of the eagle:

But never was ther dynt of thonder,
Ne that thing that men calle foudre,
That smot somtyme a tour to powder,
And in his swifte comynge brende,
That so swithe gan descende,
As this foul. . . .¹³

Beatrice's explanation of Dante's cosmic flight, in the following stanzas, is in substance identical with the learned discourse of Chaucer's eagle upon the scientific reason for the ascent of sound to the *Hous of Fame*, as in the verses:

Thus every thing, by thys reson,
Hath his propre mansion,
To which hit seketh to repaire . . .¹⁴

Chaucer's mind was probably directed to this line of reasoning by such verses as these spoken by Beatrice:

⁹ *Op. cit.*, I, 504-6, p. 337.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, I, 61-3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 74-5:

"Amor che il ciel governi,
tu il sai, che col tuo lume mi levasti."

¹² *Ibid.*, 92-3.

¹³ *Hous of Fame* 534-9, p. 337.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 753-5, p. 339.

Le cose tutte quante
 hanno ordine tra loro . . .
 Nell' ordine ch' io dico sono accline
 tutte nature, per diverse sorti,
 più al principio loro e men vicine . . .¹⁵

It is impossible to say which detail in the complex web of associations first drew Chaucer's mind to these passages in Dante; but the repeated similarities seem to render undeniable the thesis that Chaucer adopted Dante's ideas and images in the creation of his own fresh and beautifully integrated vision.

DOROTHY ARLENE DILTS

Northampton, Mass.

CHAUCEUR MENTIONS A BOOK

Commenting upon the *Book of the Duchess* in his edition of Chaucer, Professor Robinson observes:

The regular features of the love-vision, many of which reappear in the *House of Fame*, the *Parliament of Fowls*, and the *Prologue to the Legend of Good Women*—the introductory device of reading a book, the discussion of sleeplessness and dreams, the setting on May-day or in the spring-time, the vision itself, the guide (who in many poems takes the form of a helpful animal), the personified abstractions, Love, Fortune, Nature, and the like—all these are in evidence.¹

The present note is concerned with "the introductory device of reading a book." Among the sources cited by Professor Robinson,² the *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame* by Professor Sypherd offers the only treatment of this detail. Here the following observations occur concerning the *Book of the Duchess*:

The complaint of sleeplessness, the suggested explanation, the device of reading a book, the promise of a reward to Morpheus and Juno if the poet can be made to sleep, the reference to other dreams, the May morning scenery, the motive of the guide, are with slight variations all characteristic elements of the Old French love-visions.³

¹⁵ *Paradiso*, I, 103-111.

¹ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933), p. 315.

² Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 881.

³ W. O. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame* (London, 1907), p. 10. Cf. also p. 23.

In the next paragraph Professor Sypherd adds:

I have said before that the device of reading a book is due to the love-visions. Chaucer uses it to induce sleep; Froissart in his *L'Espinette Amoureuse* to develop his love-story.⁴

An examination of the evidence throws some doubt upon these conclusions.

In Froissart's *L'Espinette Amoureuse*, after a lengthy dialogue of nearly six-hundred lines between the poet and Venus, a beautiful maiden appears carrying a book. The poet asks the maiden its name and is informed, "*De Cleomades*." After an extended comment on the maiden's beauty, the poet retires to compose a ballade on love.⁵ Chaucer's mention of a book forms a contrast to Froissart. In the *Book of the Duchess*, the poet reads Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to induce sleep, and after summarising the story of Ceyx and Alcione, proceeds to narrate his own dream which constitutes the main body of the poem.⁶ In the *Parliament of Fowls*, the poet tells how he spent the day reading Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* and outlines the story. At nightfall he lays aside the book and has a dream in which Scipio acts as guide.⁷ In both of Chaucer's poems the book specified is read by the poet, its contents summarised, and the incident serves in an introductory capacity to set the mood for the entire poem. None of these details occur in Froissart, where the mention of a book plays a minor and incidental part.

What, then, may be Chaucer's source for the mention of a book? An examination of Old French love-vision literature by the present author has revealed no further examples of such an occurrence (with one exception that will be discussed presently), and it seems reasonable to conclude that the mention of a book was not a conventional device.⁸ The exception is found in the *Roman de la*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵ *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ed. M. A. Scheler, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1870-1872), I, 107 ff.

⁶ *Book of the Duchess*, ll. 44 ff.

⁷ *Parliament of Fowls*, ll. 14 ff.

⁸ I have examined the Old French love-visions listed in Professor Sypherd's bibliography, which total some fifteen poems variously authored by Machault, Deschamps, Froissart, Jean de Conde, Nicole de Margival and Watrquet de Couvin. See Sypherd, *op. cit.*, p. 5n. A further examination of the more extensive group of Old French poems in Dr. W. A. Neilson's

Rose. Here, in the opening lines, the poet mentions the *Somnium Scipionis* as authority for the belief that dreams are true, and incorrectly attributes the work to Macrobius.⁹ That Chaucer knew and imitated this passage is evident in the light of his translation of the *Roman de la Rose*¹⁰ and the fact that he incorporated it, with the same mistake in authorship, in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*¹¹ and the *Book of the Duchess* itself.¹² If it is necessary to adduce the ultimate source for Chaucer's highly developed use of the mention of a book, this passage from the *Roman de la Rose* appears preferable to Froissart's *L'Espinette Amoureuse* because of the poet's demonstrable acquaintance with it, its parallel occurrence in the introduction of the poem, and the fact that Chaucer makes use of the identical work in the opening lines of his *Parliament of Fowls*.

In post-Chaucerian literature there are two notable examples of the mention of a book. James I, in his *Kingis Quair*, relates that he read Boethius upon awakening one morning. After praising the author at great length he rises and begins his poem. Later, after describing the first sight of his future wife, he has a vision.¹³ The most sophisticated use of the mention of a book, however, occurs in Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*. Two books are mentioned here.¹⁴ The first is Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* which the poet says he has just read and proceeds to summarise. The summary is largely in Chaucer's own words and furnishes a logical point of departure for Henryson's great sequel. The second is the poem itself which he thus introduces with a literary subtlety rare in medieval literature. It is suggested that his intention was to lend authority to his narration.¹⁵

Origins and Sources of the Court of Love (Boston, 1899), *passim*, also proved fruitless. Twenty odd poems by as many authors (some of them not strictly love-visions, and with a few duplications of Sypherd) are treated by Dr. Neilson. No pertinent mention of a book was discovered in any of the above works.

⁹ *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. E. Langlois, 5 vols., *S. A. T. F.* (Paris, 1914-1924), II, 1 ff.

¹⁰ See Chaucer's *Romaunt of the Rose*, ll. 1 ff.

¹¹ See l. 3123.

¹² See l. 284.

¹³ *The Kingis Quair*, ed. A. Lawson (London, 1930), pp. 2-7.

¹⁴ See *Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson*, ed. H. H. Wood (Edinburgh, 1933), pp. 106-107.

¹⁵ For comment on this passage, see W. W. Skeat, ed., *Chaucerian Pieces*

To conclude, it seems probable that the mention of a book in love-vision literature can be correctly called a conventional device only after Chaucer. Chaucer's use of it appears highly original, and although the opening lines of the *Roman de la Rose* may have suggested it to him, he is responsible for its virtual origin and outstanding use as an integral component of the love-vision.

MARSHALL W. STEARNS

Yale University

CHAUCER AND "ARNOLD OF THE NEWE TOUN"

In a communication to the editors of *Modern Language Notes* ("The Dragon and His Brother," *MLN.*, xxvii, 229) Professor John Livingstone Lowes pointed out that the source of ll. 1431-40 of Chaucer's "Canon's Yeoman's Tale" is not, as Chaucer avers, the *Rosarium* of Arnald of Villa Nova, but a lesser known tract of Arnald's, *De Lapide Philosophorum*.

Two additional bits of interesting information are to be adduced from a close reading of these two treatises in connection with the above-mentioned and immediately succeeding lines of Chaucer's *Tale*.

The first is that Chaucer took the thought of the next seven lines following those quoted by Professor Lowes (which Chaucer himself indicates are a continuation of his citation from Arnald) also from *De Lapide Philosophorum*. Chaucer's lines read:

"And, therefore," seyde he,—taak heed to my sawe—
 "Let no man bisye him this art for to seche,
 But if that he th'entencioun and speche
 Of philosophres understand can;
 And if he do, he is a lewed man.
 For this science and this konnyng," quod he,
 "Is of the secree of secrees, pardee."¹

The passages which are the sources of these lines come in chapters one and six of *De Lapide*:

(Oxford, 1897), pp. 521-522; G. G. Smith, ed., *The Poems of Robert Henryson*, 3 vols., *S. T. S.* (Edinburgh, 1906-1914), I, 45; Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

¹ *CT.*, VIII, 1441-7 (Students' Cambridge Edition).

Therefore that art is not unless concerning the secrets of the philosophers. None, therefore, may come to this science until they have first heard logic and afterward philosophy and know the causes and natures of things and elements. Otherwise they fatigue their minds and bodies in vain.

.

The disciple said: What your words are I do not understand. And he: Is it not necessary that I should hide from you this secret of secrets as the philosophers have done, because it has not been told of this science as it has been of others?²

The other interesting fact is that the *idea* of the passage in *De Lapide* utilized in ll. 1431-40 of the *Tale* is to be found as well in the *Rosarium*, though not couched in such mystifying language. Those lines, it will be remembered, represent Arnald as quoting a dark saying of Hermes to the effect that the dragon may not be slain without his brother. And the lines continue by giving Arnald's explanation: By the dragon is meant mercury, and, by his brother, "brymstoon [sulphur]. . . . That out of Sol and Luna were ydrawe"; mercury may not be "mortified" [i. e. transmuted] without the aid of an esoteric sulphur extracted from silver and/or gold.

Here is the expression of the same idea (an idea which is the center of Arnald's alchemical teaching)³ in the *Rosarium*:

Who therefore knows to tinct mercury with Sol and Luna comes to the arcane, which is called white Sulphur, best for silver, which when it is made red, will be red sulphur best for gold. From those bodies, therefore, the exceedingly white and red sulphur is extracted, since in them is the purest substance of sulphur. . . . For its father is *Sol*; *Luna* is its mother, for from those bodies with their sulphur . . . is our medicine extracted.⁴

² Arnaldi de Villanova *Opera* (Lugd., 1532) f. 303^v: "Ars igitur ista non est nisi de occultis philosophorum. Nulli igitur ab [ad?] ha[n]c scientia[m] veniant nisi primo audiverunt logica[m] & postea ph[ilosoph]-iam & sciant causas & naturas rerum atq[ue] elementorum. Aliter frustra fatigarent anima[m] suam & corpus suum." *Ibid.*, f. 304^r: "Dixit discipulus que verba sunt non intelligo. Et ille: nonne oportet q[uod] ego occulte[m] tibi hoc secretum secretorum sicut fecerunt ph[ilosoph]i: quod non est de hac scientia sicut de aliis dictum est."

³ Cf. Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, III, 58.

⁴ Arnald, *Rosarium* (in J. J. Manget's *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa* (Geneva, 1702), I, 664-665: "Qui ergo argentum vivum cum Sole & Luna

The occasion for Chaucer's citing the title of one of Arnald's treatises while actually borrowing from another may, I believe, be deduced from the evidence. The *Rosarium* (*Rosarie*, as Chaucer calls it) is the longest and best known of Arnald's alchemical treatises.⁵ It would be the one most frequently associated with his name in alchemical circles of the fourteenth century. In this fact is ample reason for Chaucer's wishing to cite it. It did not, however, possess, for Chaucer's purpose in quotation, certain advantages belonging to the shorter and lesser-known *De Lapide*: It did not make use of the mystifying language Chaucer needed to cap the climax of confusion in the bleary-eyed and bleary-brained Yeoman's recital, such mystifying language as he found in a version of the *Tabula Chemica*, attributed to the apocryphal alchemist Senior,⁶ which the Yeoman also quotes. This advantage the *De Lapide* possessed; and it possessed as well another advantage for Chaucer, whose every tale shows his love of high-sounding, authoritative names—it quoted Hermes, the thrice great, the father of all alchemists. At the same time the alchemical idea which Chaucer borrowed from the *De Lapide* was to be found in substance, as Chaucer doubtless knew,⁷ in the *Rosarium*. No one but a purist of the deepest dye could carp at his combining the title of one treatise with a quotation from another in order to get the advantages, for the artistry of his story, of both.

EDGAR HILL DUNCAN

Vanderbilt University

tingere novit, venit ad arcanum, quod dicitur Sulphur album, optimum ad argentum, quod cum rubeum efficitur, erit sulphur rubeum optimum ad aurum. Ab illis igitur corporibus extrahitur sulphur nimium album & rubeum, cum in ipsis sit purissima sulphuris substantia. . . . Pater enim ejus est Sol, Luna mater est; quia ex illis corporibus cum suo sulphure . . . nostra elicitur medicina."

⁵ Thorndike, *op. cit.*, III, 57 ff.

⁶ Cf. J. Ruska, "Chaucer und das Buch Senior," *Anglia*, LXI, 136-137.

⁷ For additional evidence of Chaucer's wide knowledge of alchemical practice and theory, see my article, "The Yeoman's Canon's Silver Citrinacion," *MP.*, xxxvii (February, 1940), 241-262.

"WHEN HE HIS 'PAPIR' SOGHTE," CT A-4404

Chaucer's *Cook's Tale*¹ tells the story of a London victualler's frivolous apprentice named Perkyn Revelour. Perkyn had been inattentive to his duties not only because of disinclination, but also because

"... he were ny out of his prentishood" (l. 4400).

The description of this unsatisfactory state of affairs brings us to the line in question here:

"Upon a day when he his papir soghte" (l. 4404),

which seems to have puzzled the editors.² Obviously Perkyn, who either had left his master's house or was about to do so (ll. 4399-4400), was seeking to end his apprenticeship before its legal expiration. Actually, by frequenting taverns (l. 4376), he went so far as to give his master legal grounds for breaking the terms of his indenture,³ but since these tactics were not producing the desired effect quickly enough, Perkyn then (l. 4404) demanded his 'papir.' Now the 'papir' was just this, namely, an apprentice's indenture (*NED* under 'indenture' sb. 2b. special). What he wanted to do was 'to take up his indenture,' as we should say today. Meanwhile the victualler had been thinking the matter over and, when the apprentice demanded his 'papir' or indenture, the master recalled the proverb of the rotten apple (ll. 4406-07) and applying it to his own household of apprentices, gave Perkyn 'acquittance' (l. 4411) or legal evidence of discharge.⁴

"And thus this joly prentys hadde his leve" (l. 4413).

¹ W. W. Skeat ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1894), II 129; F. N. Robinson ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 73.

² On the origins and history of apprenticeship in England, see O. J. Dunlop and R. D. Denham, *English Apprenticeship and Child Labour*, London, 1912.

³ Robinson, p. 792, apparently following Skeat iv, 130, seems to regard the line as referring to the victualler and his account books.

⁴ Dunlop and Denham, p. 55.

⁵ *NED* under 'acquittance' sb. 3.

⁶ cp. *NED* under 'leave' v. 8; 'to quit the service of a person.'

NED under 'paper' sb. 2, cites l. 4404 as an instance of 'paper' in the very general sense of 'paper bearing writing,' but from the foregoing discussion it is, I think, clear that the present reference belongs under 'paper' sb. 7; 'a document written or printed on paper, as a note, bill, or other legal document' such as, in this context, an apprentice's indenture.

R. BLENNER-HASSETT

Harvard University

SANNAZARO'S ARCADIA AND GÁLVEZ DE MONTALVO'S EL PASTOR DE FÍLIDA

El Pastor de Fílida by Luis Gálvez de Montalvo was first printed in 1582. In his *Spanish Pastoral Romances*, Rennert suggests that since "Montalvo was known as a poet as early as 1568, it is possible that his pastoral romance was written not long after that date."¹ Rodríguez Marín tends to lend support to this contention in a statement made some years earlier in his *Luis Barahona de Soto*, to the effect that there are allusions in the work which refer to happenings occurring long before 1582.² He cites the fall of the young Prince Charles in 1562 while in pursuit of Doña María de Garcetas, an incident which re-appears in disguise in the sixth part of Montalvo's book. That the work was completed by 1569 derives possible additional support from the fact that the poet Gregorio de Silvestre, who in it bears the rustic name of Silvano, died during that year. Had he been dead at the time of its composition, the incident would presumably have been mentioned.

Menéndez y Pelayo calls the work one of the best written of the Spanish pastoral romances,³ but neither he nor Rennert makes any extended critical analysis of it, nor any attempt to place it in intimate relationship to other productions in the genre.

Here I shall restrict myself to the rôle played by Sannazaro's *Arcadia*.

In the Parte Segunda of *El Pastor de Fílida* we are informed that on the anniversary of the death of Elisa, beloved of Mendino,

¹ Philadelphia, 1912, p. 107.

² Madrid, 1903, p. 117.

³ *Orígenes de la novela*, I, Madrid, 1925, p. cdlxvi.

the man who in real life was don Enrique de Mendoza y Aragón, the Maecenas of Montalvo, there is a general gathering of shepherds at her grave to honor her memory. The old *rabadán*, Alfesibeo, begins by singing an elegy to her. Belisa, Filardo and Alfeo follow with songs that apparently have no connection with the solemn occasion. Sileno now calls for silence and announces prizes for the winners in various sporting events—wrestling, running, jumping and *tirar la barra*. These events are rounded out by several strong-man stunts. Finally, Galafrón sings a second elegy to Elisa and the party breaks up.

Except for a certain amount of juggling of the sequence of the events and the substitution of some details for others given in the source, for example, the prizes offered, this is a faithful reproduction of the scene depicted in Prosa undecima of the *Arcadia*. In the Italian pastoral, on the occasion of the anniversary of Massilia's death, a group of shepherds are on hand at her tomb to pay homage to her. Ergasto, who is replaced by Alfesibeo in the Spanish work, announces that there will be prizes for running, throwing the *barra* and wrestling. A strong-man stunt is also performed. Ergasto, finally, sings an elegy to Massilia.

It may be added that Alfesibeo's elegy starts with a virtual reproduction of Ergasto's plaint:

Pues el suave sentido y dulce canto
perdió la causa en testimonio desto
comenzad, Musas, vuestro amargo canto.

(*Orígenes de la novela*, II, Madrid, 1931, p. 500)

Compare

Poi che 'l soave stile e 'l dolce canto
sperar non lice più per questo bosco;
ricominciate, Muse, il vostro canto.

(*Arcadia*, [ed. Carrara], Torino, 1926, p. 121)

From here on, except for repetitions, with variations, of the refrain (line three), the rest of the composition owes little to its Italian model. But in the course of the athletic contests already described the pastorals come into a more direct contact. The foot-race is already in process and

Fronimo, corrido, criando alas de su afrenta, con dos cuerpos se le puso delante (i. e. of Folco). Uranio iba tras Folco, y Tirseo tras Uranio, cuando Fronimo vanaglorioso de su ventaja, y codicioso de la vitoria, o tropezó en la tierra o en sus piernas, que súbito pareció tendido en la

carrera y Folco sobre él, que no pudo apartarse sin caer. Uranio y Tirseo, se vieron señores del campo, y la grita y ruido de la gente, que les debiera animar, parece que los desalentó, de modo que los dos caídos levantándose, y ellos entropeciéndose todos cuatro llegaron casi juntos a los premios.

(*op. cit.*, p. 505)

How closely Montalvo draws upon Sannazaro for the above details can best be brought out by comparing the imitation with its model.

Ma Carino con maravigliosa leggerezza era già avanti a tutti: appresso il quale, ma di bona pezza, seguiva Logisto, e dopo Ofelia . . . E già vincitore Carino poco avea da correre . . . quando non so come, gli venne fallito un piede, o sterpo o altro che se ne fusse cagione; e senza potere punto aitarsi, cadde subitamente col petto e col volto in terra; il quale, o per invidia non volendo che Logisto la palma guadagnasse, o che da vero, levar si volesse; non so in che modo ne l'alzarsi gli oppose davanti una gamba, e con la furia medesima che colui portava, il fè parimente a sè vicino cadere. Caduto Logisto cominciò Ofelia con maggiore studio a sforzare i passi per lo libero campo, vedendosi essere il primo; a cui il gridare de' pastori e 'l plauso grandissimo aggiungevan animo a la vittoria, tal che . . . ottenne come si desiderava, la prima palma . . .

(*op. cit.*, p. 113)

In Montalvo Barcino and Pradelio engage in a fierce wrestling-match:

. . . y así, andando en torno gran espacio, sin dar el uno lugar al otro para sus fuerzas ni él ni el otro para sus mañas, ya sus venas estaban tan gruesas que parecían querer reventar, y el sudor de sus frentes les quitaba la vista . . . juntos se tornaron a apercebir y juntos gimieron como dos bravos toros en pelea. Ya la gente estaba admirada de la terrible y peligrosa lucha, y lastimosos los dos pastores, pero ellos mas animosos que al principio, iban buscando sus presas, quando Sileno, puesto en medio, les atajó su porfía . . . Y a Barcino le fué dado el cayado gentil, y a Pradelio el galán arco.

(*op. cit.*, p. 504)

Again, for these details, Montalvo draws heavily upon his source:

Finalmente (ie. Uranio and Selvaggio) l'un verso l'altro approssimatosi, poi che per bono spazio riguardati si ebbero dal capo insino ai piedi, in un impeto furiosamente si ristringono con le forti braccia; e ciascuno deliberato di non cedere, parevano a vedere duo rabbiosi orsi o duo forti tori, che in quel campo combattessono. E già per ogni membro ad ambiduo correva il sudore, e le vene de le braccia e de le gambe si mostravano maggiori e rubiconde per molto sangue . . . Ad ultimo alzatisi con malo animo si apparecchiavano a la terza lotta, ma Ergasto, non volle che le ire più avanti procedessero, et amichevolmente chiamatili, gli disse:—Le vostre

forze non son ora da consumarsi per un sì picciolo guidardone: eguale è di ambiduo la vittoria, et eguali doni prenderete,—E così dicendo, a l'uno diede il bel vaso, a l'altro una cetera nova . . .

(*op. cit.*, pp. 116-17)

In the first poem of the Sexta Parte of the *Pastor de Fílida* Silvano (Silvestre) and Batto engage in a violent debate over the respective merits of their compositions. Siralvo (Montalvo) agrees to act as judge in a responsive singing match if they will sing of Lúcida and Tirrena. Silvano is willing to wager his *lira de ciprés y sándalos* provided Batto will part with his *babel de pino*. As the latter does not consent to this, Silvano offers two kids and Batto a rich vase. Both invoke inspiration before singing of their lassies, after which two riddles are proposed. The contest is so even that Siralvo proclaims he cannot choose the winner between them.

In Sannazaro's verse of Prosa Nona, Ofelia and Elenco indulge in bitter recriminations over their poetic merits. Elenco would have Ofelia wager a *vacca che sovente muggiola* in return for his *pelle* and duo *cerbiatti mascoli*. They agree, however, on the wager of a lyre on the part of Elenco and two vases on the part of Ofelia. Montano is to judge of their talents. Before singing of Tirrena and Amaranta both contestants invoke inspiration and wind up by proposing riddles. Montano declares them to be of equal ability.

Since Montalvo knew that Sannazaro had followed the pattern of Vergil's third eclogue very closely, it is natural that he should simultaneously use both the Latin and the Italian compositions as his models. The description of Batto's vase is, for example, inspired by a similar description of two beech-wood cups made by Alcimedon in the Vergilian poem, while the invocation by the same shepherd ending: *pues ama el mismo Apolo misacentos* coincides with the *Et me Phoebus amat . . .* of Menalcas' invocation in the Latin eclogue. As to traces of Sannazaro here, they are most clearly visible in the *versi sdrucchioli*, and in the portraits of the two lassies: *Tirrena mia . . . Lucida mia . . .* which go back to the verse of the Prosa seconda of the Italian work.⁴

Whereas its Spanish pastoral romance predecessors, the *Diana* of Montemayor and the *Diana Enamorada* of Gil Polo, were only

⁴ See an interesting discussion of this conventionalized type of portrait by María Rosa Lida, "Transmisión y recreación de temas grecolatinos." *Revista de filología hispánica*, I, 1939, 56-57.

superficially affected by the *Arcadia*, *El Pastor de Filida*, especially by virtue of its extensive borrowing in the *Parte segunda*, established the Italian work as an indispensable model for other books of the type. This was soon to be illustrated in the pastoral romance that immediately followed *El Pastor de Filida*, Cervantes' *Galatea*, of which Scherillo in the introduction to his edition of the *Arcadia*⁵ says: "Per dimostrare . . . quanto numerose esse siano (i.e. the imitations) ci vorrebbe addirittura una ristampa della *Galatea* coi richiami in margine dei passi dell'*Arcadia*."

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

Northwestern University

SOME SANDHI PHENOMENA IN MODERN GREEK

*a in Italian Loan-words*¹

Sandhi, which played a definite role in Ancient Greek,² has become fairly characteristic of Modern Greek. The reasons for this lie, as Hatzidakis³ has pointed out, in the quick rhythm of the modern language. When two vowels collide, the weaker one is suppressed, according to a sonority scale: *a* is the strongest vowel. This strength however is not the only reason why *a* has, in Modern Greek sandhi, an especial importance; it is to be added that for *a* the possibilities of standing in sandhi are from the beginning very great. For the majority of initial changes in Modern Greek are attributable to the influence of grammatical elements: the article, the inflectional endings, and the particles, all of which often end in *a*. Hence it follows that the changed word has been changed mainly because it belongs to a certain grammatical category. Therefore I am grouping the material⁴ in grammatical categories, and

¹ Torino, 1888, p. cexlvi.

² Paper read at the meeting of the *Linguistic Society of America*, Providence, December, 1940.

³ E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, pp. 395-414.

⁴ *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 321 ff.

⁵ The material was gathered partly by myself in Greece, partly from the collections of the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek*, by the Academy of Athens now in progress, of which the first two volumes have been published: *Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς*, Ἀθῆναι 1933 ff.

giving within each group first the cases of prothesis, then the cases of apheresis, both of which are merely different results of the same linguistic process; and finally, as far as they exist, the cases of initial vowel change.

1. *The masculine noun.* The Greek masculine noun is found in sandhi position mainly in the combination of the accusative with the indefinite article *ένα*.

(a) Prothesis [6 cases]: from the Ital. *germano* "wild duck" is derived the Zantiote *ἀγέρματος*; from the Ital. *rosmarino* "rosemary" the Cretan *ἀρισμαρί*.

(b) Apheresis [2 cases]: from the Venetian *ambassador* "ambassador" is found in Kythnos *βασαδόρος* "mining worker who carries metal."

2. *The feminine noun.* With the feminine noun the indefinite article *μιά* has been of great influence.

(a) Prothesis [30 cases]: from the Ital. *furia* "fury" is found in Syme *ἀφούρια*, in Kalymnos *ἀφούρξα*, and the Tsakonian *ἀφούρια*; from the Ital. *giara* "earthen vessel" the Lesbian *ἀρξάρα* "pitcher"; from the east Venetian *magnadora* "manger" we have Mykonos *ἀμανιαδούρα*.

(b) Apheresis [6 cases]: from the Ital. *agliata*, Venetian *agiada* "garlic-sauce" is derived in Crete and Siphnos *λιάδα*; from the Ital. *andana* "line of vessels moored one behind the other along a quay" the Greek nautical term *ντάνα*.

(c) Change of the initial vowel [4 cases]: *i* or *e* to *a*: Venetian *intrada* "revenues" giving Greek *ἐντράδα* and *ἐντράδα* "revenues, landed property" and from these in Chios *ἀντράδα* "landed property"; *o* to *a*: Ital. *ombrella* "umbrella" to Greek *ὀμπρέλα* giving in Megiste *ἀμπρέλλα*; *u* to *a*: Ital. *umidità* "humidity" giving Greek *ὀμυντιτά*, *ὀμουδιτά* whence the Cretan *ἀμουδιτά*, and Western Cretan *ἀμοντιτά*; Ital. *usura* "usury" giving Greek *οὔζούρα* whence the Cephalonian *ἀζούρα* "usury, interest." The change of the initial vowel can well be explained through the influence of a preceding *a*, which suppressed this weaker initial. It is possible, however, that in these cases no phonetic change has occurred, but that at first the original initial vowel was lost in sandhi, and then, after this apheresis, prothesis took place secondarily. This hypothesis presupposes an intermediate stage without initial vowel, and indeed such a stage is to be found in all the mentioned cases: Cretan *ντράδα*, Lesbian *μπρέλλα*, Cephalonian *μουδιτά*, Middle Greek *ζούρα*.⁸

⁸ M. A. Triandaphyllidis, *Die Lehnwörter der mittellgriechischen Vulgärliteratur*, Strassburg 1909, pp. 19, 136.

⁹ Cf. A. Thumb, *Indogermanische Forschungen* VII (1897), 9. P. Kretschmer, *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt verglichen mit den übrigen nordgriechischen Mundarten*, Wien 1905, p. 139. *Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικόν*, vol. I s. v. *a*.

3. *The neuter noun.* In sandhi neuter nouns are found especially in combination with the plural definite article *τά* and, in lesser degree, with the indefinite article *ένα*.

(a) Prothesis [10 cases]: from the Old Ital. *rimore* "bustle; insurrection" is derived the Cephalonian *ἀρεμούρο* "tumult of a crowd," Laconian *ἀλεμούρο* "robbery" and the derivative *ἀλεμουριάζω* "rob"; from the Aroumanian loan-word *avγίλιε* "violin" we can infer a hypothetical Greek basis **ἀβγιολί*: the Greek word is derived from the Venetian *violin*.

(b) Apheresis [5 cases]: from the Ital. *aiuto* "help" we find in Mykonos *γιούτο* "alleviation, relaxation"; from the Ital. *appalto* "monopoly" derives the Cephalonian *πάπρο*.

4. *Adjective and adverb.* From the nature of the adjective it follows that the changes caused by sandhi are based on a combination of all the possibilities which apply to nouns: the change can proceed from masculine or neuter after *ένα*, from neuter after *τά*, from feminine after *μά*.

(a) Prothesis [2 cases]: from the Ital. *svelto* "agile" we find in Corfu, Crete, Syros, Andros, Astypalaia *ἀσβέλτος* and in Chios the fem. derivative *ἀσβεπρσύνη* "agility."

(b) Apheresis [1 case]: from the Venetian *acupado* "gloomy" is derived Cephalonian *κουπάδος* "dejected; lowly situated."

(c) Change of the initial vowel [3 cases]: *i* to *a*: from the Ital. *innocente* "innocent" is derived the Cephalonian *ἀνοτσέντες*.

Adverbs have been influenced especially by the respective adjectives, the first person of the aorist in *-α*, and prepositional phrases. I noted 2 cases of prothesis, 1 of apheresis and 1 of change of the initial vowel.

5. *The verb.* With the verb the particle *νά* from Ancient Greek *ἵνα*, introducing the subjunctive, and the particle *θά* from Ancient Greek *θέλω ἵνα*, introducing the future tense, have been of primary influence.

(a) Prothesis [8 cases]: from the Venetian *refudar* "to refuse" is derived the Cretan *ἀρεφονδέρνω* "forsake," and *ἀρεφονδάρω* "turn out of doors" which latter is used by the Cretan Mussulmans; from the Ital. *varare* "to launch (a ship)" is derived the general nautical term *ἀβαράρω* "move a ship in order to avoid collision."

(b) Apheresis [12 cases]: from the Ital. *allegrare* "to delight" is derived the Thessalian *λιγάρω* "be glad" in which the origin of the apheresis becomes evident from the Thessalian idiom *νά χαρῶ καὶ νά λιγάρω* "may I be joyful"; from the Venetian *aidar* "to help" is derived in

Siphnos *διάρω* which was formed via an intermediate metathesis (still alive in Siphnos and Crete) *διιδάρω*.

(c) Change of the initial vowel [4 cases]: *i* to *a*: from the Ital. *imbarazzarsi* "to interfere" is derived the Cephalonian *ἀμπατσάρομαι*.

My assumption that the phenomena of prothesis and apheresis are caused by these grammatical elements (*ένα, μιά, τά, νά, θά*) is based on the frequency of the latter; but it expresses no more than a tendency. Other combinations also lead to the same result. So, with feminine nouns, a preceding adjective: Thera *ἀλιγαδούρα* "sort of cord" from Venetian *ligadura* "fastening" may derive from a nautical term *ἴσια λιγαδούρα* "flat seizing"; Leucas, Cephalonian *ἀβάλη* "small bay" from Venetian *vale* "fishpond of the lagoon" can be based on an adjectival combination, as shown in the place-name *Βαθειὰ Βάλη* ["deep bay"] on the west coast of Acarnania, opposite Leucas. Or, a preposition may be the determining factor: Syros *ἀνεγότσιο* n. "increase of price" from Venetian *negozio* "trade" may have been formed through an idiom like *γὰν νεγότσιο* "for resale." Certainly, the aorist of verbs, which ends, in the first person, in *-a*, has often played a rôle: the nautical term *τράκος* m. or *τράκο* n. "collision" from Ital. *attracco* may have lost the initial *a*- through idioms like *ἔπαθα τράκο, ἔκαμα τράκο, ἔδωσα τράκο*.

Now, besides these genuine sandhi phenomena there are numerous cases of prothesis and apheresis of *a* which may result from other linguistic tendencies. In these cases, it is difficult to be sure how far these tendencies have worked in connection with the sandhi tendencies and how far they have acted independently. Within the material of loan-words 4 groups of such cases can be distinguished: (1) analogy; (2) popular etymology; (3) phonetic reasons; (4) reasons lying wholly in the Italian. I give some examples.

(1) *Analogy*. If there are found in Chios the verb *ἀμάρω* and the noun *ἀμίρα*, which derive from Ital. *mirare* "to aim a gun," *mira* "sight (of a gun)," we can not decide whether both words have developed the prothetic vowel without reference to each other, or whether it was transferred from the one to the other. The Bithynian adverb *ἀνέτα* "liberated," certainly derives from the Bithynian adjective *ἀνέτος* which is based on Ital. *netto* "clean, clear, pure"; the *a*-prothesis of this adjective seems, for geographical reasons, to derive from the respective verb: Ital. *nettare* "to clean, to clear" gives, in Ainos (Eastern Thrace), Cyzicus and

Bithynia, ἀνατέρνω, and in Madytos (Eastern Thrace) ἀνετέρνω, probably a popular etymology under the influence of the preposition ἀνά. Ital. *agganciare* "to seize with a hook" gives on the Ionian Islands γαντζάρω, γατζάρω, in Crete γαντζέρινω; perhaps the initial *a* dropped because the word was felt as a denominative derivation from general-Greek γάντζος m. "hook" which for its part descends from the Venetian-Ital. *ganzo*, *gancio*. The *a* may also be affected by morphologic analogy: Ital. *arresto* appears in Messenia in the idiom τὸν ἔβαλε ρέστο "he arrested him"; here, perhaps the *a* dropped because *arresto* was taken to be an Ital. adverbial formula **a resto*, and because the *a* often dropped in such formulas. Besides these examples of formal analogy, Ital. *petto* "breast" on Greek soil offers an example of semantic analogy which is based on the corresponding Greek στήθος n. "breast": influenced by the gender of this Greek noun, πέτος in some of the Cyclades becomes neuter; in Crete the analogy goes farther: just as the plural στήθη (by analogy with the neutra in -ι) became στήθια and produced the new singular στήθι, πέτος shows the plural πέτια and the new singular πέτι and μπέτι; and finally, as the last stage of the analogy, just as the plural τὰ στήθια produced a new singular ἀστήθι, in Crete μπέτι, through the plural τὰ μπέτια became ἀμπέθια, from which resulted the new singular ἀμπέτι.

(2) *Popular etymology.* Among popular etymologies, the prefix-prepositions play a major rôle: thus we see the influence of ἀνά in Cephalonian ἀναπολιτάνα "trick in game of cards," from Ital. *napoletana*; the influence of ἀντί in Laconian ἀντιβινιαριστικά adv. "approximately": the adverb belongs to the adjective *ἀντιβινιαριστικός which is a deverbal derivative of *ἀντιβινιάρω from Old Ital. *indivinare* "to guess"; we see the influence of ἀπό in Aegium ἀπαγάδα from Venetian **pagada* "calm"; and the influence of διά in the nautical term διαρίζω "mould" which derives, through Greek βιάρω, from Ital. *avviare*. Popular etymologies are numerous; for example: Ital. *lunario* "almanac, calendar" appears in Zante as ἄλωνάριο which is influenced by Greek ἄλωνάρις "July"; Friul. *pládene* "large dish for cakes" is widely spread in Greece as ἀπλάδενα, ἀπλαδένα, ἀπλαδένι "dish tray," whose *a-* can be explained through influence of Greek ἀπλάδα "large, flat dish."

(3) *Phonetic reasons.* It is possible that initial *a-* has at times been produced by assimilatory processes: Venetian *inganar* "to

deceive" is found as *ἀγκανάρω* in the Ionian Islands, Crete, the Cyclades, the Dodecanese, and Macedonia. It is possible that at times the accent has been of influence: in Ithaca, from the (metathetical) aorist *ἀκροξερίστηκα* which belongs to Ital. *accorgersi* "to notice," a new present *κροτξερίζομαι* was formed; in this new formation the initial syllable was still more removed from the accented syllable, and by this the dropping of the *a-* was facilitated.

(4) *Reasons lying wholly in the Italian.* Finally, the *a* arose or disappeared for reasons which lay not in the receiving, but in the giving language, and so exemplify linguistic mixture. If Venetian *réfolo* "blast of wind" in the Cyclades appears with *a*-prothesis (as *ἀρέφουλας* and *ἀρεφουλιά*), this fact may be explained by the Ital. idiom *a réfoli* "with sudden squalls" which was adopted by the Greeks as a whole. If the word *pagai* of the Venetian idiom *esser pata pagai* "to be square with somebody" appears as *ἀπαγαῖ* or *ἀπαγάδι* in the Ionian Islands, Crete, and Morea, the *a*-prothesis may be explained by the possibility that the final *-a* of *pata* in the Ital. idiom was connected by the Greek ear with *pagai*. On the other hand, verbs like *ἀρεφονδάρω* < Venetian *refudar* may be based on Italian (Venetian) couples like *arecomandar-recomandar*, *arecordar-recordar*.

In conclusion we can state the following facts: among the 97 cases in which are to be found changes through sandhi concerning *a* among Italian loan-words in Greek, there are 58 cases of prothesis, 27 cases of apheresis, and 12 cases of vowel change. Therefore, prothesis is the most frequent phenomenon. Apheresis appears mainly with verbs. Among the 97 cases, 40 pertain to the feminine noun, 24 to the verb, 15 to the neuter noun, 8 to the masculine noun, 6 to the adjective, 4 to the adverb. This means that the combination with *μέα* was the strongest, next follows that with *νά* and *θά*, then that with *τά*, and finally that with *ἐνα* which has produced only a few changes. It seems to me that the main reason for this phenomenon lies in the strength of the vowel. The adjective, although exposed because of its three genders to many more possibilities of sandhi position, appears to be less strongly linked than the noun with the preceding word. I was not able to establish a relation between sandhi changes and certain definite sounds; at most I found that prothesis occurred mainly before *p*, which already had played a rôle in the prothesis of Ancient Greek.⁷ A chronology of

⁷ E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, pp. 411-412.

the process is hardly possible, since the great mass of the material belongs to the dialects and has therefore been recorded neither in literary monuments nor in documents; the earliest proofs are: of *a*-prothesis ἀμπάρα "a game" from Ital. *barra* "cross-bar" in the Chronicle of Morea (14th c.);⁸ and of *a*-apheresis κοσπαρίζω "approach" from Ital. *accostarsi* in a work of the Rhodian Emmanuel Georgillias (15th c.).⁹ In the 16th and 17th centuries quotations are more copious. The geographical distribution of sandhi-changes certainly depends on the geographical distribution of the Italian loan-words: so my examples are to be found above all in the Ionian and Aegean Islands, in Crete, Cyprus, and Morea. The words in common use belong to the nautical terminology. I believe that the numerous Italian loan-words in Modern Greek offer good material for presenting the tendencies and possibilities of Modern Greek sandhi. To be sure, they can serve only as examples of phenomena which already have been observed; but, as a cultural complex within the Greek, they show these phenomena with especial clearness. They prove the continuity of the linguistic process of sandhi, and the strong assimilatory power of the Greek language.

RENÉE TOOLE KAHANE

Urbana, Illinois

SOME NASHE MARGINALIA CONCERNING MARLOWE

The copy of John Leland's *Principum Ac illustrium aliquot & eruditorum in Anglia virorum Encomia*¹ in the Harmsworth collection at the Folger Shakespeare Library contains several holo-

⁸ Ed. John Schmitt, London 1904, pp. 352, 600.

⁹ Ed. G. Wagner, *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*, Lipsiae 1874, p. 38, v. 208; p. 39, v. 222. Of course, sandhi phenomena are older in Greek than our loan-word material shows and Romance loan-words from Greek bear witness to forms like τᾶργα (< τὰ ἔργα) → τὰ *ἔργα (REW 6097, 6096 and Schuchardt, *ZRPh* xv, 91, note 2).

¹ With subtitle, *Quibus adiuncta sunt aliquot heroum hodie viuentium a T. Newtono exarata*, Londini, ap. T. Orwinum, 1589. Leland's poems, edited by Newton, are given on the first 112 pages. Page 113 is a new title page reading *Illustrium aliquot Anglorum Encomia*, A Thoma Newtono, Londini, ap. T. Orwinum, 1589. Newton's own Latin poems occupy the remaining 19 pages.

graphic items, hitherto unpublished, which are of interest to students of Nashe and Marlowe. On the back of the title page is Nashe's signature; and in his handwriting on the margins of pages 130 and 132 are quotations from Marlowe's *Faustus*.²

The signature, if authentic, is of special importance because only two other signatures by Nashe seem to be known.³ It is, moreover, the latest of the three, the others dating from 1584 and 1585. Of its authenticity we may, I think, feel reasonably confident. It is marked by the same beautiful and precise penmanship which distinguishes Nashe's subscription to the Latin verses upon *Ecclesiasticus* 41:1. Particularly close similarities between the two occur in the final "e" and the initial "N" of "Nashe," and in the "omas" of "Thomas."

Nashe's quotations from *Faustus* are written on the two final leaves of Leland's book. The first, entered lengthwise in the left margin on page 130, clearly reads: "Faustus:⁴ Che sara sara deuinyntie adieu," and is an unmistakable excerpt from Faustus' opening soliloquy:

What doctrine call you this, Che sera, sera:
What will be, shall be? Divinity adieu! (I, i, 48-9.)

In a similar position on the left margin of page 132, the words "divinity adieu" seem to be repeated; but I cannot be sure of the exact spelling of "divinity." There is an undue number of minim strokes after the "t."⁵ On the same page is a further

² For suggestions in the identification and deciphering of the writing I am indebted to Miss Jeanne Rose and Dr. James G. McManaway of the Folger Library.

³ See W. W. Greg, *English Literary Autographs 1550-1650* (London, 1932), I, Plate xx. I have been unable to find references to any others in McKerrow or elsewhere.

⁴ The mark resembling a "g" after the "t" in both writings of "Faustus" is a frequent Elizabethan abbreviation for terminal "us." See S. A. Tannenbaum, *The Handwriting of the Renaissance* (New York, 1930), p. 127.

⁵ Is Nashe punning on the word "ninny" in his two spellings of "divinity"? In the first spelling there is a suggestive extra syllable, "deuinyntie"; and the second spelling may be "deuiyntninie." Compare Greene's pun, "Niniuersitie" for "University" in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (ed. Collins), II, iv, 874. Mischievous word-play of this sort is, of course, highly characteristic of Nashe.

quotation, considerably blurred: "Faustus: studie in indian silke."⁶
The reference apparently is to the passage in Faustus' second



- (1) Signature, generally accepted as Nashe's, appended to Latin verses upon *Ecclesiasticus* 41: 1, written as a school exercise at Cambridge. Reproduced here from Greg, *loc. cit.*, as a standard of comparison.
- (2) Signature on the back of the title page of the Folger copy of John Leland's *Principum Ac illustrium aliquot & eruditorum in Anglia virorum Encomia*.
- (3) and (4) Marginalia on pp. 130 and 132 respectively of the same book.

soliloquy, some 40 lines after the first quotation, in which Faustus proposes to have his servant demons

⁶ To the left of this jotting, and very badly smudged, is the signature of Patricke Smith, probably a later owner of the book. I cannot identify him. Immediately to the right of the word "studie" are the letters "Ja," which seem to be by a third hand, the hand of James Choudemby (or perhaps Chonlemly—the name is very hard to decipher), whose signature is scrawled lengthwise in the left margin of page 112. Presumably he was still another owner of the book. On the title page itself are two further broken phrases in Nashe's hand: "printed bookes in these" and "things thought uppon," the latter followed by a very faint writing of the word "Faustus." The significance and connection of these phrases with the play escape me.

fill the public schools with silk
Wherewith the students shall be bravely clad (I, i, 91-2).

A few lines earlier Faustus has also thought of making his spirits "fly to India for gold" (I, i, 83). Unlike the "divinity adieu" quotation, this one is not exact, and seems rather to be the jotting down of an idea derived from the play than an attempt to recapture the identical words. Since *Faustus* was not published until after Nashe's death, Nashe is probably remembering what struck him when he saw the play performed.

The question must be asked whether the two quotations from *Faustus* are certainly in Nashe's hand. In my judgment they are. The resemblance between them and Nashe's subscription to the verses on *Ecclesiasticus* is closest in the two writings of the word "Faustus," where the hand is less cursive than it is in the later portions of the quotations. The capital "F's" of "Faustus" should be compared with that of "Fundatrice," and the medial "t's" with those of "illustrissima," "Margareta," and "Fundatrice." Quite noteworthy also is the fact that under the second "divinity adieu" is drawn a horizontal line crossed with two somewhat curved vertical pen marks, serving as a concluding flourish. This is exactly the same as the flourish underlining the Nashe signature on the back of the title page of Leland's book. If that is a genuine signature, then the second "divinity adieu" is likewise genuinely by Nashe; and if the second is, surely the first, of which it is merely an echo, also is. In this way, as well as in the other ways already indicated, all three marginal entries in the Leland are closely bound together.

One would give a good deal to know why and when Nashe wrote these *Faustus* quotations. Nothing in the text of the pages on which they appear seems extremely likely to have brought them into his mind. However, there is one brief poem on page 130 which may possibly have suggested "divinity adieu." It is addressed by Thomas Newton "Ad reuerendū D. Alexandrum Nouellum, verē theologum . . .," and wishes him long life "Ut populum doceas coelestis pabula vitae." The utter contrast between Nowell and Faustus may be working in Nashe's satirical intelligence. If not, the true cause seems unascertainable.

With regard to the date of the signature and the marginalia, we can take at least one step forward. In his Preface to Greene's

Menaphon, written in 1589,⁷ Nashe deplores the small number of contemporary Englishmen who write good Latin verse: "Thomas Newton with his *Leiland*, and Gabriell Haruey, with two or three other, is almost all the store that is left us at this houre."⁸ Beyond all doubt, by "Thomas Newton with his *Leiland*" Nashe means the edition of Leland's poems to which the Folger copy belongs. This work was published in a single edition, in 1589, and contained original Latin poems by Newton as well as Leland's poems edited by Newton.⁹ But whether Nashe owned this particular copy of the book in 1589 is, of course, a somewhat different question. Nevertheless, all the probabilities are in favor of it. A man who has read in 1589 a book published in 1589 and who can be shown to have owned a copy of that book, may be presumed under ordinary circumstances to have owned the copy in 1589, and to have signed his name in it at the time he got it.

More speculative, but still probable, is the further conclusion that Nashe also wrote the marginalia in 1589. He never again mentioned the book in his writings. It was not a popular work, nor, as far as I can see, one that he would be likely to reread from time to time. Unless evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, we may stand upon the natural presumption that the signature and the marginalia are approximately coetaneous. Those who support a date of 1592 for *Faustus* will have to take this presumption into account. It is by no means conclusive, of course; but it has distinct value in favor of a date of 1589, or earlier, for Marlowe's play.

Apart from questions of date, the marginalia offer significant testimony of Nashe's interest in the dramatic work of the man whose *Dido* he was later to revise for publication. The spectacular nature of the quotations chosen is likewise significant. Nashe was obviously fascinated by *Faustus*' daring rejection of religion, and twice penned the blasphemous words. The idea of students wearing silk to their classes had for him an exotic appeal of a not very different kind. Facts like these must have a bearing on our conception of Nashe's character.

PAUL H. KOCHER

The Folger Shakespeare Library

⁷ Entered in the Stationers' Register on August 23, 1589. There is no entry for Leland's *Principum Encomia*.

⁸ Ed. McKerrow, III, 320.

⁹ See n. 1, above.

THE EXCHANGE OF WEAPONS IN *HAMLET*

Mr. Gay's criticism¹ of Mr. J. Dover Wilson's treatment² of the bout in *Hamlet* fails to include the most important criticism of all—the impossibility of effecting the exchange of weapons by Mr. Wilson's method. Mr. Gay dwells on a less important mistake, the incongruous use of armor, which Mr. Wilson retains in his revised edition.³ To diverge for a moment, another minor mistake is overlooked by Mr. Gay; Mr. Wilson believes that in the third bout, scored "Nothing neither way," "the point of Laertes' weapon . . . becomes jammed in the projecting hooks on the hilt of his [Hamlet's] dagger."⁴ Such a jam is impossible with the plain cross-barred daggers the Elizabethans used for duelling, although locks seem to have occurred occasionally in the *pas d'ânes* and side-rings of the *rapier* hilt. However, the deliberate causing of any lock on the stage would have been extremely difficult and quite unnecessary. Osric's unsolicited "Nothing neither way" does not need to end a bout, for not only are we not certain of the status of Elizabethan officials (if there were any) but also the bout may simply have been stopped by the fencers after a sequence of hard action, at which Osric notes the obvious, that there were no hits either way.

Mr. Wilson's exchange of weapons is provoked after Laertes makes a treacherous thrust into Hamlet's arm, when his

bleeding (made visible to the audience) shows him that Laertes holds a sharp, and he determines to get possession of it. Accordingly, he closes with him, beats aside his dagger with the dagger in his own left hand, and suddenly dropping to the ground the foil in his right, seizes with the empty hand the hilt of the sword he covets and wrests it from the enemy's grasp . . . he pauses in ironical courtesy to allow Laertes to pick up the discarded foil.⁵

It is unnecessary to beat the daggers together if they are bated; they have no value in the bout which has suddenly become a real

¹ A. A. Gay, "The Fencing Match in *Hamlet*," *RES*, XIII (1937), 326.

² J. Dover Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet*, 2nd ed. (London, 1937), pp. 276 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

⁵ *What Happens in Hamlet*, p. 285. Mr. Wilson notes that this exchange was suggested to him by Mr. Evan John in an article in *TLS*, January 25, 1935.

duel with only one effective weapon.⁶ It is impossible to wrest a rapier from an opponent's right with the right hand; experiment with the weapons has shown that there is insufficient leverage to overcome the contemporary grip of the first or first and second fingers over the rapier quillon. This right-hand disarm is not mentioned in the Elizabethan fencing manuals, and is after all a disarm and not an exchange. And there is also the important difficulty that Hamlet may spit himself on Laertes' sharp weapon if he drops his own. Wilson has not considered how Hamlet is to get past the point to get to close quarters, and repeated attempts to disarm by right-hand seizure on the fencing floor have convinced me that no rapierman would risk his life so rashly.

Many methods have been used and suggested to effect the exchange of weapons: beating, binding, hard parrying, and Mr. Wilson's right-hand seizure. But all of these methods have the same three faults: they are disarms only and not true exchanges of weapons, they are not mentioned in the contemporary fencing manuals,⁷ and none of them can actually break the strong grip of one or two gloved fingers over the quillon without the connivance of the actor of Laertes. Even if Hamlet did by some beating method succeed in knocking Laertes' weapon to the floor there would be nothing to prevent the frightened Laertes from retrieving it before Hamlet could discard his own weapon and snatch it up. This beating is the traditional stage method, and was used by Mr. Maurice Evans with ludicrous effect.

But there is one disarm, already mentioned by three scholars, which does provoke an exchange, which is included in three important Elizabethan fencing manuals, and with which a skilled fencer can invariably break the grip of gloved fingers away from the rapier quillon. It is probable that enough is now known of the subject to show that the exchange Shakspeare intended in *Hamlet* and three other plays⁸ was that of left-hand seizure. This provokes a counter seizure and exchange instead of a disarmament

⁶ An excellent argument for the daggers being bated lies in the fact that Hamlet forces an exchange; if the daggers were unbated he would not have dared to come to close quarters to make a seizure. Dagger thrusts cannot be parried.

⁷ With the single exception of one mention of the di Grassi disarm.

⁸ *Twelfth Night*, iv, i, 29; *Antony and Cleopatra*, v, ii, 47; *Cymbeline*, v, ii, 5.

only. There are six separate mentions of left-hand seizure in the rapier manuals of Saviolo and di Grassi, and there is an entire chapter on the "grype," as it was called, in Silver's *Bref Instructions Upon My Paradoxes of Defense*.⁹ Di Grassi describes how the rapierman may

take holdfast of the enemies sword, nere the hiltes thereof, yea though his hand were naked, and under his own sworde presently turning his hand outwards, which of force wresteth the sword out of the enemies hand,¹⁰

and experiments with the weapons have shown that the defender cannot successfully resist the outward twist of the attacker's left hand. Silver, in his excellent treatise on swordplay, gives the defense of counter-seizure for the attempted left-hand seizure:

but yf he will cloze with you, then you may take the grype of him safely at his comynge in, for he that by strong pressing in adventureth the cloze loseth it.¹¹

And though Silver's instructional manual was apparently unpublished in his day, the fact that it was prepared for publication indicates that the matter contained is substantially what Silver taught.

These quotations indicate, I believe, that the only method of effecting the exchange which the Shakspearean company would have been at all likely to use was left-hand seizure. Burbadge, the actor of Hamlet, was to receive the treacherous thrust, and then, as though suddenly aware of the chicanery, force the actor of Laertes to an exchange. At single rapier or rapier-and-glove Burbadge would find and lift the "sharp" point with his own, and pass in to "take holdfast" of Laertes' quillon with his left hand. When the actor of Laertes realizes that his hilts are held and he cannot resist being disarmed, his instinctive, and academic, reply is to take the "gryp" of Hamlet's hilts to disarm him. Even if Laertes is aware that Hamlet's blunt weapon will be only of limited use in defending himself against the sharp, it is better than nothing, and Laertes knows Hamlet's murderous intentions from the fact that he is forcing an exchange. Hamlet twists outward and

⁹ *The Works of George Silver*, ed. Cyril Matthey (London, 1898), cap. 4.

¹⁰ *True Arte* (London, 1594), sig. Aa3.

¹¹ *Bref Instructions*, Cap. 4, section 24, "The manner of certain grypes and clozes to be used at the single short sword fight &."

Laertes is disarmed; Laertes also twists, and both step back to pass the exchanged weapons from their left to their right hands.

This is in keeping with the direction of Quarto 1, "They catch one another's rapiers"; it provokes an exchange and not merely a disarmament; and it is a test of skill and determination that the fencing-minded Elizabethans could enjoy thoroughly. At rapier-and-dagger the exchange is substantially the same, although obviously Hamlet must be rid of his dagger before he can make a seizure. This can be done before forcing the "cloze," or, more effectively, the dagger can be used to hold the dangerous blade aside while the Hamlet actor passes inside the length of the blade. The dagger can then be dropped and the seizure taken, and Laertes can drop his dagger to make his counter-seizure. The actor of Hamlet could also take di Grassi's hint and "sling the dagger in deed at the enemies face."¹²

Aside from the disarm and exchange in *Hamlet*, Shakspeare has two other uses of disarming, and one mention of it. A soldier snatches a dagger from Cleopatra when she is about to kill herself;¹³ and Posthumus vanquishes and disarms Jachimo in *Cymbeline*,¹⁴ probably at sword and buckler. It is interesting to note that both Hamlet and Posthumus were probably played by the same actor, Burbadge.¹⁵ And in *Twelfth Night* Sir Toby orders "Hold, sir! or I'll throw your dagger o'er the house."¹⁶

From the discussion that follows, it is clear that seizure is intended. The fact that Shakspeare used the disarmament three times indicates that he had some method of disarming in mind, and this is most apt to have been the common contemporary one of left-hand seizure.

Aside from the six mentions of seizure in the rapier manuals and Silver's chapter and frequent mentions, the only other description of a disarm in Elizabethan fencing manuals is the lone passage in di Grassi (sig. Bb) on an almost impossible disarm by beating with both the attacking blade and the dagger. This might effect a disarm but not an exchange; it is in addition to di Grassi's two mentions of seizure; and it is impossible at rapier-and-glove, which

¹² *True Arte*, sig. Bb. ¹³ *Antony and Cleopatra*, v, ii, 47. ¹⁴ v, ii, 5.

¹⁵ T. W. Baldwin, *Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*, pp. 237, 238.

¹⁶ iv, i, 29.

is required in Folio 1.¹⁷ Experiment with this disarm has convinced me that it will practically never break the grip of gloved fingers. We may safely conclude that the very natural disarm and exchange by left-hand seizure was almost the only disarm known to the Elizabethans and consequently the one most apt to appear on their stages.

It is evident that seizure was known and practiced all during the seventeenth century, and even the more polite smallsword techniques of the eighteenth century often included it for self-defense. Thus the treatise of Labat (Paris, 1698) gives illustrations¹⁸ for the use of the left hand in disarming the opponent and in preparing a deliberate riposte; and the fine English text of Angelo (London, 1763) illustrates¹⁹ the disarm of left-hand seizure as taken from four parry positions. There is even a tendency for the instinctive use of the left hand to appear in hard modern fencing, and there is a clause in the American rules to prohibit it.²⁰

Several opinions support the use of left-hand seizure to effect the exchange in *Hamlet*. An unsigned article in the *Saturday Review* in 1886²¹ written more in the measured style of Edgerton Castle than the vivacious style of Alfred Hutton, described the exchange by seizure as illustrated in Sainct Didier's *Traicté* (Paris, 1573).²² The author quotes Sainct Didier's terse description of the use of seizure to meet seizure: *à prise faut faire contreprise*. Also, the short historical sketch preceding the instructional matter of a Victorian fencing manual²³ suggests the use of the left hand as the solution to the exchange in *Hamlet*. Mr. Lee Mitchell had also suggested²⁴ the use of the left hand, I have discovered, but he gives Laertes the impossible reply of right-hand seizure. Miss

¹⁷ This was advanced by Wilson in his Introduction to *Hamlet*.

¹⁸ Reproduced in Edgerton Castle's *Schools and Masters of Fence* (London, 1896), pp. 222, 223.

¹⁹ Reproduced as plates 49-54 in Alfred Hutton's *Old Sword Play* (London, 1892).

²⁰ *Fencing Rules*, Amateur Fencers' League of America (New York, 1939), p. 14.

²¹ LXVII, 479-481.

²² Reproduced in Castle's *Schools and Masters of Fence*, pp. 84, 85.

²³ W. H. Pollock, F. C. Grove and Camille Prevost, "Fencing," *Badminton Library* (London, 1889), p. 17.

²⁴ "Fencing Scene in *Hamlet*," *PQ.*, XVI, 71-75.

Selma Guttman mentions²⁵ the exchange by seizure but she, like Mr. Mitchell, does not give any evidence of contemporary use; her thesis that the weapons in all the productions of *Hamlet* by Lord Strange's men were "single rapier" is not supported by the exchange of left-hand seizure, for, as described, it can also be instigated from rapier-and-dagger. Sir Edmund Chambers has listed²⁶ seizure as one of three ways to effect the exchange, but he inexplicably gives the instigation of the exchange to Laertes, the last person apt to do so. To conclude, the fact that left-hand seizure was the only workable disarm known to the Elizabethans, together with the supporting opinions of two fencers and three scholars, indicates that left-hand seizure was the method intended by Shakspeare in *Cymbeline*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Hamlet*.

JAMES L. JACKSON

The University of Illinois

THE PREMIÈRE OF *THE MOURNING BRIDE*

The date of the first performance of *The Mourning Bride* has not been completely determined. From John Downes' *Roscius Anglicanus* we know that Congreve's tragedy was acted "Uninterrupted 13 Days together," and from a letter dated March 16, 1696/7, it is clear that the play ended its initial run on the preceding Saturday, March 13. On the basis of these two facts D. Crane Taylor has stated¹ that the play was first staged on Saturday, February 28, presumably a misprint, for Saturday was the twenty-seventh. More recently, Professor John Hodges has left the date in doubt by stating that the play had its première on Saturday, February 27, "unless the Lenten season closed the theatres on Wednesdays and Fridays, in which case the première must have been a week earlier."² It is the intent of this note to argue that the first performance more probably than not was on Saturday, February 20, 1696/7.

²⁵ "The Fencing Bout in *Hamlet*," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, xiv, 86-100.

²⁶ *Hamlet*, ed. E. K. Chambers (Boston, 1904), p. 186.

¹ *William Congreve* (London, 1931), p. 98.

² *William Congreve, the Man* (New York, 1941), p. 59 n.

As a means of establishing this point, it is necessary to ascertain theatrical custom in Congreve's day in regard to acting during Lent. Restoration practice in respect to Lenten acting was influenced by that in pre-Restoration years. In Elizabethan times it apparently varied a good deal, for sometimes there was a prohibition of any acting during Lent and in other years performances were banned only on Lenten Wednesdays and Fridays. During the reign of James I the legal authorities were usually strict in forbidding acting on those days.³ After the Restoration the general rule apparently was that the theaters were closed on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent and during the entire week preceding Easter. An examination of Pepys' *Diary* reveals that this practice was fairly closely followed in the years he attended the theatres. On three occasions when a play was offered on a Wednesday or Friday in Lent, Pepys takes special notice of these deviations from the customary practice. On Thursday, March 21, 1667, he went to the Duke of York's playhouse,

where unexpectedly I came to see only the young men and women of the house act; they having liberty to act for their own profit on Wednesdays and Fridays this Lent: and the play they did yesterday, being Wednesday, was so well-taken, that they thought it fit to venture it publickly today.⁴

In 1669 he referred to performances on Wednesday, March 3, and Wednesday, March 17, both in Lent; on each occasion he made specific reference to the fact that the plays were being acted "only by the young people."⁵ At the end of the seventeenth century the custom seems to be well established. From 1696 to 1701 Lady Morley attended plays very frequently, but she did not record

³ The principal discussion of this tradition appears in W. J. Lawrence's "The Origins of the Substantive Theatre Masque," *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 326-34.

⁴ *Diary*, ed. Wheatley, vi, 219.

⁵ *Ibid.*, viii, 228, 248. On the other hand, Pepys appears in other years to have seen plays on occasional Wednesdays and Fridays in the first week of Lent. In 1661 February 27 was Ash Wednesday, yet he attended a performance on Friday, March 1; in 1668, when February 5 was Ash Wednesday, he attended a play on Friday the seventh, but not on a Wednesday or Friday thereafter in Lent. In 1669 also, when February 24 was Ash Wednesday, he saw a play on Friday the twenty-sixth. Even if the custom of having performances in the first week of Lent were being followed in 1697, it would not affect the argument of this paper.

attendance on a Wednesday or Friday during Lent.⁶ For the season of 1703-04, when theatrical advertisements first appeared in the *Daily Courant* with sufficient regularity to offer satisfactory evidence of theatrical customs, there were no performances advertised for Wednesday or Friday in Lent or for the full week before Easter; in fact, the practice was rigidly observed in the patent houses until near the middle of the nineteenth century.

Since it seems very likely that this custom prevailed in the later years of the seventeenth century, what would be its effect upon the first run of *The Mourning Bride*? In 1696/7 Ash Wednesday was February 17 and Easter was April 4. Since it is known that the run of the tragedy ended on March 13, it would appear that, omitting Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays during the preceding two weeks, the play must have been first acted on Saturday, February 20, with successive performances on February 22, 23, 25, 27, March 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13. Downes's statement that it was acted "Uninterrupted" for thirteen nights is no barrier to this interpretation, since he undoubtedly referred to the customary acting nights and clearly meant that no other play interrupted the run. There seems no adequate reason, therefore, for believing that there would be any deviation from normal practice for the opening run of *The Mourning Bride*.

EMMETT L. AVERY

The State College of Washington

COKAIN'S *THE OBSTINATE LADY* AND *THE ARAUCANA*

Sir Aston Cokain's *The Obstinate Lady* is, as Alfred Harbage declared, "of native inspiration,"¹ but in the process of adapting Massinger's *A Very Woman* Cokain made a curious borrowing. In Massinger's play Antonio disguises himself as a blackamoor slave in order to woo his stubborn lady. In Cokain's, Carionil tricks himself out as an Ethiopian prince. As such he might have

⁶ The list of performances appears in Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), pp. 377-79.

¹ *Cavalier Drama* (New York, 1936), p. 133.

indulged in the dramatic convention of talking gibberish supposed to be comical. Instead he reflects Cokain's taste by boasting a knowledge of Spanish, which, he says, will further his cause with Polidacre, his prospective father-in-law. He proves his knowledge by speaking two lines of Spanish which seem to be original with him,² then gives further proof by citing, apropos nothing in the neighborhood, a stanza of Spanish which is labeled *Acaucana* (which Maidment and Logan correct to *Araucana*):

Y pues en todos triempos, y ocasiones
 Por la causa comun sin cargo alguno,
 En battalas formadas, y esquadrones
 Puede usar delas armas cada uno:
 Por las mismas ligitimas razones
 E's licito combate de uno a uno,
 A pie, a cavallo, armado, disarmado
 Ora sea campo abieto, ora estocado.³

The stanza does occur in Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga's oratorical epic of the struggle for Chile: *La Araucana*, Part III, Canto xxxvii, Stanza 8.⁴ Polidacre rises to the Spanish bait to ask, "*Habla, voste, yngles?*" Since the answer is "Yes, sir! I learned your language in Bruxels," the dialogue proceeds with only one more Spanish debt, again to the *Araucana*. When asked his name, the pseudo-Ethiopian Carionil replies, "'Tis Tucapelo," plainly adapting the name of Tucapel, one of the great warriors of the Arauco Indians.

ERNST G. MATHEWS

The University of Illinois

² James Maidment and W. H. Logan, *The Dramatic Works of Sir Aston Cokain* (Edinburgh, 1874), p. 68:

"Estoy yo, como deve, muy lobrego;
 Porque de mi, Lucora haze un negro."

Incidentally, several among the scrambled geographical allusions in the play are to Spain and Spanish America. There is one literary allusion (p. 61)—to Rosinante and Sancho's ass.

³ *The Obstinate Lady* (1658), III, iii. Maidment and Logan (p. 68) made the following changes: *tiempos* for *triempos*, *causo* for *causa*, *comun* for *comun*, *legitimas* for *ligitimas*, *Es* for *E's*, *el* added in l. 6, comma added at end of l. 7, *se a* for *sea*, *abierto* for *abieto*.

⁴ Edición hecha por la Universidad de Chile (Santiago, 1933), II, 395.

KAULBACH'S ILLUSTRATED EDITION OF GOETHE'S
REINEKE FUCHS, 1846

Under numbers 1739 and 1740 the catalogue of the Speck Collection of Goetheana at Yale University¹ lists two copies of this work, the sole difference noted being in the imprint: *München, Literarisch-artistische Anstalt* (No. 1740) and *Stuttgart und Tübingen, J. G. Cotta* (No. 1739). Aside from this difference in the imprint the two copies are described as being one and the same work.

In my first copy the title runs as follows: *Reineke Fuchs von Wolfgang von Goethe mit Zeichnungen von Wilhelm von Kaulbach gestochen von R. Rahn und A. Schleich. München. Verlag der Literarisch-artistischen Anstalt. 1846*. The second copy has the imprint: *Stuttgart und Tübingen. J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag. 1846*. Even a cursory examination reveals that we have here two entirely different printings, which can be distinguished off-hand in the canto-headings *Erster [-Zwölfter] Gesang*, which, in the Munich edition, are set in hollow, open letters, of the same font as *Wilhelm von Kaulbach* on the title-page of both copies; in the Stuttgart edition these headings are in heavy, black-face letters of the same size. Also textually there are numerous and striking differences, of which only a few can here be noted:

I, 181 zu großem Erstaunen M, zum großen Erstaunen S. I, 275 Tage der Herrn M, Tage des Herrn S. II, 96 Nehmet M, Nehmt S. III, 2 von weitem M, von weitem S. III, 309 daneben M, darneben S; similarly IV, 63; X, 275; XI, 383. IV, 81 Alles wußt' M, Aber wußt' S. V, 41 drauf bald M, bald drauf S. VI, 107 Drüber M, Mir darüber S. VIII, 205 die Menschen M, den Menschen S. VIII, 328 Donarius M, Denarius S. IX, 135 Braunen M, Braun S. X, 118 alle fremden M, alle fremde S; similarly XII, 107. X, 428 deinem Ränzel M, dem Ränzel S. X, 464 sich länger nicht M, nicht länger sich S. XI, 363 Märtenaffe M, Martin, dem Affen S. XII, 171 empfindichsten M, empfindlichen S.

In all these instances, which could be supplemented by hundreds of others, the Munich edition has the original, correct reading, and can therefore be presumed to be the earlier of the two. On the other hand, there are also some passages, not nearly as numerous as the above, in which the Stuttgart edition has the preferable readings:

¹ *Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust*. A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University Library Staff Edited by Carl Frederick Schreiber, New Haven, 1940.

i, 229 die Sept M, die Sext S. ii, 14 ihr solltet M, ihr sollet S. iv, 260 vernahm' M (misprint), vermahn' S. v, 11 erhub M (misprint), überhub S. v, 189 sein Herz M, ein Herz S. vi, 136 vom Hofe M, von Hofe S. vi, 384 Meiner Frau M, Meiner Frauen S. ix, 38 verkleiden M, zu verkleiden S. ix, 150 treibt M, trieb S. x, 50 wieder Bellyn M (misprint) Widder Bellyn S. xi, 202 Vetter M, Vettern S.

In some of these cases the misprint in M is so palpable that any careful compositor could correct it: in other cases, however, the correct reading is not so easily seen, and it is plausible to assume, therefore, that the Stuttgart edition goes back, not to the Munich edition, but to an independent source, at least for the proof-reading.

The thirty-six full-page engravings by Kaulbach, which are the *raison d'être* of the edition, require comment. Seventeen of them (those facing pages 1, 2, 5, 19, 25, 36, 57, 82, 84, 94, 109, 126, 139, 144, 170, 248, 252), were engraved by Rahn, and so signed; seventeen (those facing pages 12, 13, 43, 53, 56, 59, 70, 105, 122, 124, 128, 193, 196, 227, 232, 238, 247), are signed by Schleich, who also did the engraved title; the one facing page 199 is by Steifensand, and the one facing page 255 lacks the name of the engraver. All three of my copies, two with the imprint: *München* and one with the imprint: *Stuttgart und Tübingen*, agree in these respects. In the latter edition, each engraving has the further notation: *Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhdlng.* (in the lower left corner), *München: Literar. artist. Anstalt.* (in the lower right corner), with the name of the printer between them: *Druck v. I.² Niederbühl in Stuttgart.*

All the plates of the Stuttgart and Tübingen edition agree in this notation. I have noticed no deviation. In the Munich edition, seventeen plates (those facing pages 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 19, 25, 36, 53, 56, 57, 70, 105, 128, 144, 193, 196) lack the names of the publishers; sixteen (those facing pages 43, 59, 82, 94, 109, 124, 126, 139, 199, 227, 232, 238, 247, 248, 252, 255) have: *Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhdlng. München: Literar. artist. Anstalt* (like the Stuttgart and Tübingen edition), and the remaining three (facing pages 84, 122, 170), have: *Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhdlng. Leipzig: G. J. Göschen. München: Literar. artist. Anstalt.* This description applies to my first Munich copy: in the second copy the names of the publishers are lacking on plates facing pages 84, 122,

* On some plates it is: *J. Niederbühl.*

170, as well as on those facing pages 59 and 227. That Goeschen had a share in this edition does not seem to have been noticed hitherto.

In the first copy of the Munich edition only three plates (those facing pages 2, 193, 227) are marked as having been printed by J. Niederbühl in Stuttgart; four others (those facing pages 5, 13, 57, 196) have no indication of the printer, and the rest have various notations: *Gedr. b. Taube von Wilhelm in München* (facing pages 1, 56); *Gedruckt von Wilhelm bei Taube in München* (facing pages 53, 144); *Gedruckt v. Wilhelm in München* (facing pages 59, 82, 94, 109, 126, 139, 170, 247, 252, 255); *Gedruckt v. Joh. Wilhelm in München* (facing p. 248); *Gedruckt von W. Wick in München* (facing pages 12, 19, 25, 36, 70, 105, 199, 232); *Gedruckt v. Wick in München* (facing pages 43, 84, 238). The second copy of the Munich edition differs from the foregoing description in that the plates facing pages 105, 128 have: *Druck von J. Niederbühl in Stuttgart*; plates facing pages 59, 122, 170 are marked: *Gedruckt von Wilhelm bei Taube in München*. It is to be presumed that other copies will show slight deviations in this respect.

It is to be noted in conclusion that the first copy of the Munich edition is unique in having pasted on the board covers the wrapper of the *Zehnte Lieferung*: "Reineke Fuchs von Wolfgang v. Goethe mit Zeichnungen von Wilhelm von Kaulbach gestochen von R. Rahn und A. Schleich. Zehnte Lieferung. München. 1846. Verlag der Literarisch-artistischen Anstalt." Below the words "Zehnte Lieferung," is a woodcut, signed *WK*, in the full width of the page, depicting Reineke driving the chariot of the Cotta firm, with the date of 1640. Tied to the chariot, and dragged along behind it on the ground, is a terrified individual grasping his wig in his left hand, whilst under his right arm he has several books, on the covers of which one can decipher the words: "Kritik über Reineke Fuchs Verantwortliche Redaction des Kunstblatt Stuttgart." This woodcut, which is not repeated in the book itself, seems not to have been noticed by bibliographers.

W. KURRELMAYER

DER EINGANG DES LORSCHER BIENENSEGENS

Der erste Spruch des Lorscher Bienensegens ist entstellt überliefert; auch wer sich mit dem Wortmaterial der Handschrift abfindet, muß immer noch die Wortfolge ändern, um ein wenigstens metrisch befriedigendes Bild zu erhalten. Heute liest man allgemein,¹ unter Preisgabe des rhythmisch nicht korrigierbaren ersten Verses, im Anschluß an Steinmeyer:

Kirst, imbi ist hucze.	nu fluic du, vihu minaz, hera
Fridu frono in godes munt	heim zi comonne gisunt.

Von metrischen Zerstörungen abgesehen schien der Sinn des Ganzen klar. Niemandem fiel auf, daß den Bienen geboten wird zu fliegen, nachdem sie doch schon draussen sind. Der Zauber, den man dem Bienenschwarm nachruft, hat das Ziel, das ausgeschwärmte Volk wieder zurückzuzwingen. Der Befehl "Fliege" leistet das nicht, weil das Fliegen des Schwarms gleichbedeutend mit seinem Ausfliegen ist, wie aus Vers 4 unseres Textes hervorgeht und noch der heutige Sprachgebrauch bestätigt, wo vom Fliegen der Bienen synonym mit ihrem Ausfliegen gesprochen wird. Es spricht vieles dagegen, *hera* zu *fluic* zu ziehen und zu übersetzen *fliege hierher*, z. B. die Handschrift, die *hera* gegen die Zeile so auffällig absetzt und an den Rand rückt, daß es fraglich sein kann, ob es überhaupt zur ersten Zeile gezählt werden kann.²

Es ist aber nicht nur dieses Adverb, das sich weder in das Schriftbild noch in das Metrum der Zeile fügen will und dessen Auslaut sich in der bayrischen Mundart des Wiener Hundesegets legitimer ausnimmt als im Rheinfränkischen unseres kaum vor dem Jahr 1000 aufgezeichneten Spruchs, es ist die Form *fluic*, die genauer Betrachtung nicht standhält.

¹ Seemüller schreibt *Kirstes imbi*, wobei er *vos estis ancillae domini* der Wiener Handschrift 751 im Auge hat und die Wolfsthurner Handschrift, die von den Bienen sagt: *Ain dieren gotes, die do wurcht ein werk gotes des herren*.—Wenn überhaupt eine Korrektur, dann jedenfalls *Kirsti imbi* mit Verschleifung der beiden *i*; so daß überhaupt keine eigentliche Konjektur nötig ist.

² "Daß *hera heim* zusammengehören, ist wohl die allgemeine Ansicht; dann darf man aber die beiden Worte nicht trennen" (Koegel 1, 2, 157); "*hera* kann zu dem von der Überlieferung durcheinandergeworfenen Wortmaterial der zweiten Langzeile gerechnet werden." (Unwerth: *Beiträge XLII* [1918], 117 f.).

Der gleiche Imperativ steht in Vers 4 als *fluc*. Bei einem so flüchtigen Schreiber besagt das nicht viel, man würde die Variante passieren lassen, wäre sicher, er hätte so geschrieben. Pfeiffer, der übrigens *fluic* liest, hat seinem Aufsatz ein Facsimile beigegeben, aus dem so viel sicher zu sehen ist, daß weder *fluic* noch gar *fluic* geschrieben ist. Unentscheidbar, ob die ersten Buchstaben als *fd* oder *fol* zu lesen sind, das Folgende ist jedenfalls *uic* oder *nic*. Nicht möglich ist die Auflösung in *fluc* d. h. in die einzige im Spruch sonst belegte Form. Wer *fluic* liest, nimmt an, daß der Schreiber sich verbessert hat; aber wenn er im Wortanfang änderte und *fduic* > *fluic* korrigierte, warum hat er dann das falsche *i* stehen lassen? Änderte er den zweiten Buchstaben, aber den vierten nicht? So wird man wohl richtiger mit der Handschrift *folnic* lesen und darunter einen regulären Imperativ des regulären Verb *fol-nigan* verstehen. Ähnliche Bildungen sind *fol-faran* = 'einen Weg völlig zurücklegen,' *folla-queman* = 'zu Ende kommen.' *Fol-nic* = *wende dich völlig* ist der rechte beschwörende Anruf der Bienen nach ihrem Ausschwärmen.

Was soll mit *hera* werden? es wirkt schwach und überflüssig, ob man es nun mit *heim* oder mit *folnic* in Verbindung bringt; so daß ich der durch die Schreibung nahegelegten Versuchung, es ganz zu tilgen und als Schreiberreminiszenz an andere Reisesegen zu erklären, nachgeben würde, hielte mich nicht eine Erwägung zurück:

Der Spruch ist vom Standpunkt des Magischen aus mangelhaft. Man vergleiche seinen dürftigen Wortlaut mit der magischen Eindringlichkeit des zweiten Spruchs, der mit Zeile 3 einsetzt. Schon das gedoppelte *sizi* ist weit überlegen. Die Doppelung *hurolob ni habe du—zi holze ni fluc du* und noch schöner im nächsten Vers *noh du mir nindrinnes—noh du mir nintwinnest* zeigt, worauf es bei der Beschwörung ankommt. Es ist mein stärkster Einwand gegen die beiden Eingangszeilen, wie sie vorliegen, daß sie alles vermissen lassen, was wir von einem magischen Spruch erwarten. Sie leisten die Arbeit der Beschwörung nicht. Vergeblich suchen wir nach Parallelismus oder Variation. Ein schwacher Rest magischer Technik ist in dem Zusammentritt der erstarrten Alliteration *frido frono* mit *in godes munt* zu erblicken. Diese synonymen Phrasen sind aus der altgermanischen Rechtsprache überkommen, deren Sinn ebenfalls darauf gerichtet war, zu binden, zu verpflichten, in beschwörender Eindringlichkeit auf

den Willen dessen zu wirken, der dem Richterspruch unterlag. Grade diese Seite der Beeinflussung ist mit dem einmaligen Imperativ, sei er nun *wende dich* oder *fliege*, ganz unzureichend berücksichtigt. Was da fehlt, ist die Wiederholung. Es müsste ein variierender Imperativ hinzutreten, so wie zu *indrinan—intwinan*. Noch einmal und stärker, unterstrichen und doppelt müsste gesagt werden, was binden und bannen soll.

Das würde das Wort *kere* leisten, das ich anstelle von *hera* vorschlage:^a

Wende dich völlig, mein Vieh, kehre dich!

Im Gottesfrieden, in Gottes Hut heimzukommen.

Einem Schreiber, der in ein- und derselben Zeile *indrinnes* mit *d*, *intwinest* mit *t*, die Verbalendung einmal als *-es*, das zweite Mal als *-est* schreibt, der nach allgemeiner Annahme seine Worte durcheinandergeraten läßt, wird kein bitteres Unrecht zugefügt, wenn man ihm die Verwechslung von *k* und *h* zutraut. Nur diese; denn er sprach wahrscheinlich schon *here*. Die volle Endung ist nur der Nachklang einer alten sakralen Formel, wie sie im Wiener Hundesegegen vorliegt. Unter dem Einfluß der noch geläufigen Heimkehrsegen veränderte sich ihm *kere* also nicht einfach in *here*, das seine *Sprechform* ist, sondern für *here* schob sich ihm die *Spruchform* *hera* unter.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

Yale University

REVIEWS

Arthur, Dux Bellorum. By ARTHUR G. BRODEUR. Berkeley: University of California Publications in English, III, 237-284, 1939.

The reader will recall that, in the *Historia Brittonum*, Nennius introduces the name of Arthur with the words:

Tunc Arthur pugnabat contr'illos in illis diebus
Cum regibus Brittonum, sed ipse dux erat bellorum.

The passage has long been an historical crux, and Professor Brodeur addresses himself to it with masterly precision, learning,

^a *kere* aus älterem *keri* schon bei Otfrid, später bei Notker.

and acuity. He says at the outset: "Was there an Arthur who led British forces against the Saxons? If so, when did he flourish, and in what part of Britain? With what phase of the struggle were his activities concerned?"

Gildas, who wrote about 500 A. D. (about two centuries before the oldest portions of Nennius), does not mention Arthur, but he deals with the coming of the Saxons, which he dates some time after 446. This dating agrees with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which, following Bede, dates the first Saxon invasion in 449. Thurneysen and Ferdinand Lot, however, have questioned this testimony because certain Gallic chronicles report that the provinces of Britain became subject to the Saxons by the year 441-442, and both the *Historia Brittonum* and the *Annales Cambriae* aver that the Saxons first came in 428. In the first section of his treatise Brodeur proves, I think, that Gildas was right: the Saxon invasion, apart from "sporadic raids," did not take place until 447.¹

Section II deals with Nennius' relation to "a *Liber Sancti Germani*" (not the fifth-century *Vita* by Constantius) and the consequent "distortions" Nennius made in the material that came to him from Gildas. The most interesting point made here is the observation that "since Vortigern's name is British [the *superbus tyrannus* of Gildas], and his immediate realm seems to have been Wales, his opposition to Ambrosius [the character in Gildas whom Arthur replaces] is to be explained on the ground of the historical conflict in interest between the prevaillingly Celtic north and west of Britain and the Romanized east and south." That conflict erupted into civil war, and it is clear that Gildas (and later Nennius) is on the Roman side. In the victories over the Saxons (actually, the Jutes) Nennius names a battle at Episford, where he says Horsa was slain; the victor is Guorthemir, a fictitious person who, according to Brodeur, was substituted by Nennius for Ambrosius. Brodeur's theory is that *Episford* may be identified with *Ægelsthræp*, where the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* places the death of Horsa in 455. That is an ingenious suggestion, but it amounts to little more. It is true, if we subtract the 44 years mentioned by Gildas from the date of the Battle of Badon (about 500), "we arrive at the date 456" for the activities of Ambrosius; nevertheless, there remains the problem of names, and these differ materially from one another.

This brings us to the *Arthuriana* proper—in section III—the central theme of the treatise. Here, I may say frankly, my own views are at considerable variance with those of Brodeur. Lack of space prevents my discussing them fully here; moreover, my own theory has now been set forth in an article appearing in *Modern*

¹ In note 12 a reference might have been made to Lot, *Nennius et l'Historia Brittonum*, p. 2, where Lot admits the untrustworthy character of the Chartres MS.

Philology.² However, it is essential to point out that Brodeur enunciates the theory that "Arthur was the great national champion against the Jutes,"—a belief, he argues, which can scarcely be later than the seventh century. Arthur's battles must, therefore, be placed in the South. "Not only does British tradition make him the hero of Badon; the *Arthuriana* fixes his activities against the Jutes, . . . and the *Annales Cambriae* dates his death at a time when there was no serious warfare with the Saxons north of the upper Thames Valley." How this unknown hero happened to bear the name of "Arthur" he nowhere adequately explains. As for the sentence (*Tunc Arthur pugnabat* etc.) with which Nennius introduces his name, Brodeur holds that it is pre-Nennian, "lifted," he says, "from a British-Latin poem in hexameters—perhaps a verse chronicle." But, and here is the crux, "the enumeration of battles which immediately follows this sentence . . . could not have been drawn from any work embodying genuine tradition."

Had Brodeur read the works of Malone, Lot, and Thurneysen on this question with the care that he devotes to his other material, he would, I think, have expressed himself differently. See Lot (*Nennius*, pp. 78, 112, and 130), where it is shown that not only was Arthur, in the words of Faral, "quelque chef breton du Nord," but there are cogent reasons for thinking that the majority of the battles listed indicates the territory of his activities; so that it is by no means precluded that the battles embody "genuine tradition." Lot summarizes what I believe to be the correct attitude in the words:

Qu'importe après tout que les chapitres où l'on parle d'Arthur soient de Nennius rédigeant en 826, ou d'un prédécesseur du siècle précédent? Ce détail est secondaire. Ce qui demeure c'est que la légende arthurienne existait. Arthur était déjà un héros national, sinon un roi—on nous en avertit [*sed ipse dux erat bellorum*]. Ses exploits guerriers étaient localisés alors dans le Nord de la Bretagne.

As for the twelfth battle, that of Mount Badon, which Brodeur, relying on the relatively late *Annales Cambriae*, considers so important, Lot has this quite simple explanation (p. 70):

Ce nom est emprunté à Gildas (c. 26), lequel nous avertit qu'il écrit 44 ans [see below, note 6] après cette bataille qui fut un grand succès pour les Bretons. Mais il ne parle pas d'Arthur et ne fournit pas la plus légère précision sur ce Mont-Badon.

It would follow, then, that Nennius (or the Pseudo-Nennius) introduced the exploits of Arthur, a northern hero, into the Gildas-Bede account of the struggle of the romanized British of the South against the Saxons or Jutes. This was done by lumping the eleven

² 39 (1941), 7-14. On p. 14, note 1, I incorrectly stated that Professor Jackson identified Catraeth with Carriden; as a matter of fact he agrees, with some reservations, that it is *Catterick*.

original battles³ of Arthur with the Battle of Badon, with which he originally had nothing to do. Thus a northern hero—whose real enemies were not the Saxons but the Picts and Scots—comes to replace in the text of Nennius the Ambrosius Aurelianus of Gildas.

It is obvious, I think that both Arthur and Ambrosius are Roman names. Arthur is the Roman family name Artorius, the *dux legionum*, paralleling Nennius' *dux bellorum*, in the well-known CIL account of him discussed by Malone in *MP.*, 22 (1924-5), 367-74.⁴ Thurneysen (*ZCPH.*, 20 [1933], 136) accepts Malone's identification, though with the introduction of a singular vagary of his own. What seems to me, however, so significant in Malone's discovery is the fact that L. Artorius Castus—the *dux* in question—was the commander of the important Roman Sixth Legion while it was stationed in Britain and took an illustrious part in the construction of both the Hadrian and the Antonine Walls⁵ in the North, the region in which Anscombe and others have localized several of the Arthurian battles found in Nennius.

Hence it would follow that in Nennius' shift of Arthur from the North to the South, from a Roman fighting the Picts and Scots to a Brito-Roman fighting the Saxons, we have an epic parallel to Roland; this hero, properly a Frank, defeated by the Basques, underwent a shift to Roland, the national hero of the French, defeated by the Saracens.

In section IV Brodeur shows clearly the confusions and contradictions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. He agrees with Chadwick and Myres, rightly I think, that the account "of Cerdic's wars is a West Saxon attempt to filch credit for Jutish exploits." Gildas is trustworthy: "Badon [Mount] must have been a victory over the Jutes." In his last section (V) Brodeur takes seriously what the *Annales Cambriae* say about Arthur and Medraut at Camlann.⁶ I am still inclined to regard this event as fiction, the source of which I do not know. Nor can I accept the statement that

³ See Lot, p. 68, for his view of Anscombe's and Faral's identifications. In the main, I agree with Lot; but I have not space to discuss his views here.

⁴ See Brodeur, p. 279, where Artorius is relegated to a footnote.

⁵ On this, see Sir George MacDonald, *The Roman Wall in Scotland*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1934, esp. p. 409.

⁶ All that we actually know about Camlann, is that the name contains the rather frequent Celtic element *cam-* (from *kambo* 'crooked'); see Eilert Ekwell, *English River Names*, pp. 64-68. The most recent attempt to locate Camlann in the North is by O. G. S. Crawford, *Antiquity* 1935, pp. 289-90. While I agree with Brodeur (p. 283) that Crawford's 'philology' is not faultless, the latter includes in his article a useful suggestion by Kenneth Jackson that Nennius' *Linnuis* may be Lindensia, modern Lindsey (although Lindisfarne also comes to mind). This strikes me as sound, certainly on the phonological side; on Lindensia as a district, see Collingwood and Myres, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, Oxford, 1936, pp. 412-16, and pp. 460-61, on the question of Badon.

Arthur's and Medraud's death "at Camlann [mentioned by the *Annales*] suggests that Modred's opposition to Arthur may derive from genuine tradition rather than from the imagination of Geoffrey of Monmouth." That is the type of positivism in scholarship which I think we should avoid.⁷

This interesting and well-written little treatise concludes with three appendices; one on the "Dates for the Coming of the Saxons," another on that of the "Siege of Mount Badon," and a third (actually Appendix II) seeking to justify the theory that the passage (*Tunc Arthur pugnabat contr' illos in illis diebus*) can be scanned as hexameters. It would serve Brodeur's theory as well as mine, if this hypothesis could be upheld! But that is doubtful.

WM. A. NITZE

University of Chicago

Letters of William Shenstone. Edited with an Introduction by DUNCAN MALLAM. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, [1939]. Pp. xxxvi + 475. \$7.50.

The Letters of William Shenstone. Arranged and Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index by MARJORIE WILLIAMS. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. xxviii + 700. 32s. 6d.

When Hans Hecht published, in 1909, a series of letters exchanged by Shenstone and Thomas Percy, the small volume was cordially welcomed by *Modern Language Notes* in a review of nearly 4,000 words (xxvii (1912), 19-25). The reviewer—W. H. Hulme—thought that Shenstone was at long last revealed as "a gifted letter-writer," possessed of a "charming epistolary style almost equal to Cowper's." He went on at length to show how the newly discovered letters refuted charges against Shenstone made by some of his contemporaries, and how they exhibited the poet as "a man of broad and profound learning, of deep human sympathy and interests," and "of exquisite taste in the best things of literature and art." Many changes have occurred since this notice appeared. For one thing, in these sterner days reviewers for *MLN* can no longer indulge in the luxury of expatiation which Hulme enjoyed. But not everything has changed. Interest in Shenstone has continued, and increased. Hulme's estimate cannot now be accepted without serious qualification; yet Shenstone remains entertaining and significant, and it will not be disputed that there was need for a complete collection of his extant letters.

No need existed, however, for two attempts at such a collection;

⁷ On the Arthur of certain British saints, see Tatlock, *Speculum* 14 (1939), 345.

and it is a matter for something more than regret that the two editions listed above appeared simultaneously, in January, 1939. Miss Williams was first on the job, and everybody, including Mr. Mallam, has known for some years what she was doing. She announced that she was at work on her edition in July, 1933 (*RES*, ix, 291). In 1935, in the Preface to her *William Shenstone, A Chapter in Eighteenth Century Taste*, she repeated her announcement. Furthermore, in the M. H. R. A. bulletin, *Work in Progress*, 1938, she was listed as still engaged in this undertaking. Nobody knew that Mr. Mallam, at the University of Minnesota, had entered into competition with Miss Williams. His own explanation of his enterprising endeavour in gum-shoes deserves not only quotation, but a more prominent position than he gives it in a footnote to his prefatorial "Editor's Note," dated "November, 1938": "We learn," he says, "as we go to press, of a forthcoming edition of the letters of Shenstone by Miss Marjorie Williams, a book of which we had long since reluctantly despaired and which we now welcome with renewed interest." Mr. Mallam's interest can easily be imagined; but the facts in this case speak for themselves and need no ironical or other emphasis. Miss Williams was not, considering the magnitude and difficulty of the task, unreasonably long in completing her edition. Obviously, moreover, Mr. Mallam did not take the trouble to get into communication with her. Obviously, too, his own work, however hasty, must have required a not inconsiderable time. His reluctant despair, therefore, must have been a quite alarming mushroom growth.

Mr. Mallam seeks to disarm criticism of another kind by modestly stating that his edition "cannot make any pretence of even approaching the definitive"; though he goes on at once to say, not only that he has printed everything he could find, but that "it is hard to believe" other letters, if they turn up, can "be of sufficient number or importance to change our estimate or greatly increase our understanding of the man who wrote them." This seems to mean that his edition is, after all, as close an approach to "the definitive" as is humanly possible when letters are in question. But, no matter what Mr. Mallam means or says, he has in effect demanded comparison with Miss Williams, cannot escape it, and cannot object to it. And comparison, as we shall see, leads to no uncertain conclusion.

Miss Williams has 313 letters, and, in addition, prints Shenstone's "Billets," which she and Professor Irving L. Churchill (who first published them in not quite complete form, *PMLA*, LII, 1937, 114-121) rightly regard as "an integral part of the Percy-Shenstone correspondence." Mr. Mallam does not print the "Billets" and has only 284 letters. Miss Williams has 125 letters not previously printed in any form, as against Mr. Mallam's 96. But these figures do not tell everything about the search of the two

editors, because Mr. Mallam has seven letters not in Miss Williams's volume, and she has, consequently, 36 not in his.

None of the manuscripts used by either editor has been easily accessible to this reviewer, but many of Shenstone's letters exist today only in versions printed by Dodsley in the volume of *Letters to Particular Friends* which he published in 1769 as Vol. III of the first collected edition of Shenstone's *Works*. A comparison of several of the letters with their sources in Dodsley shows that neither editor is impeccable in transcription, but shows also that Mr. Mallam departs from Dodsley's text far more often, and more seriously, than Miss Williams. For the letters compared (Dodsley's I, XX, XLI, and C), Miss Williams shows 16 departures, and Mr. Mallam 45. Most of these departures, in both books, are insignificant, consisting of omitted periods, commas, hyphens, or dashes; but Mr. Mallam fails seriously in transcription fairly often, whereas Miss Williams does not similarly fail once. For example, in Dodsley's Letter XX Shenstone writes, "I am not yet satisfied about mottoes," and Mr. Mallam omits "yet." Later in the same letter Shenstone writes, "One caution I gave Mr. W—," which Mr. Mallam prints "One caution I gave to Mr. G—," adding in a footnote that "Mr. G—" is "probably Graves." Again, in Dodsley's Letter C, Shenstone writes that a picture which Alcock was painting (the portrait of him now in the National Portrait Gallery) is "two feet, three inches and three-quarters" in width, which Mr. Mallam transforms into "three feet two inches and three quarters." When he is printing from manuscript sources, it should be added, Mr. Mallam occasionally leaves blanks indicating, he says, that the manuscript is defective; but Miss Williams fills in most of these blanks without remark. This difference arises, no doubt, from the difficulty of working exclusively from rotographs; but neither that difficulty, nor any other easy to imagine except simple negligence, will explain Mr. Mallam's omission of a large part of his Letter 68, and of parts of his Letter 89. It should also be mentioned here that he omits a long postscript to his Letter 184. In this case, however, the reason is that the postscript at some time got separated from the letter and finally landed in the Library of the University of Texas, where Miss Williams found it and Mr. Mallam did not.

The two editors differ in a number of cases in their efforts to date the letters, and also, less often, in their identifications of persons addressed. Sometimes one guess is as good as another; but in most instances Miss Williams appears to be right. Yet to this there is one important exception: Miss Williams's Letter 292 clearly should precede her Letter 290, and Mr. Mallam has these letters (269 and 270 in his edition) in the right order.

Professor Cecil A. Moore contributes a graceful Preface to Mr. Mallam's volume, towards the close of which he commends the notes:

"Of the annotations it need be said only that they are an indispensable help even to readers familiar with the period and could have been provided only by a competent and conscientious scholar." Doubtless he would now like to obliterate these words; for Miss Williams's notes are immeasurably superior to Mr. Mallam's, and show him up for the tiro he is. Mr. Mallam, for example, does not attempt to identify a single Latin quotation, whereas Miss Williams tracks down every one. The difference between the two may be further illustrated by their notes to a passage in the last paragraph of Miss Williams's Letter 109 (Mr. Mallam's 112). Shenstone is thanking Lady Luxborough for her civility to a Mr. Pearsall, his relation, and goes on to allude to a book being written by him. Mr. Mallam's note reads: "I have not with any certainty been able to trace either Mr. Pearsall or his book." Miss Williams's note reads:

Richard Pearsall (1698-1762), religious writer in the manner of Rev. James Hervey. Some of his poems appeared in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1736. The book to which W. S. refers is probably *Contemplations on the Ocean, Harvest, Sickness and the last Judgment, in a series of letters to a friend*, 1753. The family of Pearsall of Hawn finds mention in Nash's *History of Worcestershire*.

Miss Williams may or may not be right about the book; and it should be said that she fails to explain or to identify some allusions. But in general she brings adequate learning and mastery of the relevant facts into effective play, and acquits herself well in her use of her material. She keeps her notes from running into too much space, but does present the letters in their setting; and in particular she makes it easily possible to map out Shenstone's reading. Mr. Mallam, one must add, like too many graduate students of the present generation, shows himself unable to handle evidence properly when he does have it. For example, in a long note on p. 47 he wrestles with the question of Shenstone's visits to London in the early 1740's, shows everybody who has preceded him to have been more or less wrong, and then jumps to an unwarranted conclusion. It has been thought that Shenstone visited London early, or fairly early, in 1741, 1742, 1743, and 1744. Mr. Mallam triumphantly points out that, as regards 1743, we have only Shenstone's "declaration of intention to set out for London 'some time next week,'" and no direct first-hand information that he actually did go. We do not have, either, any information showing or suggesting that he failed to go; but Mr. Mallam's conclusion is that he was not there at all in 1743. (Other examples of the unwarranted conclusion are to be found in note 1, p. 269, and in note 3, p. 461.)

This comparison could be extended further, but enough has been said to show how it must end. Mr. Mallam's edition is definitely inferior in every respect to Miss Williams's. Neither edition is

complete, and both exhibit faults of execution, but Miss Williams is head and shoulders above the gentleman from Minnesota at every point. The one reason for the existence of Mr. Mallam's book is the seven letters he includes which eluded Miss Williams's search. These come pretty high at a trifle over \$1.07 apiece, and none of them is essential for any ordinary purpose of any reader or student.

It is possible to add only a word concerning the large number of letters now first printed by the rival editors, or now first gathered together and made easily accessible. The most important of these fall into two series, the letters addressed to Lady Luxborough, and the notes addressed to John Scott Hylton. The former are certainly useful, indeed valuable, but they can add nothing to Shenstone's reputation as a letter-writer. They become tiresome before one is through with them, just as their writer became tired of Lady Luxborough. The notes to Hylton, however, one would not have missed for anything. And the letters as a whole form a treasurable addition to eighteenth-century literature. They do not place Shenstone alongside Cowper, or Walpole, or even Gray. He remains somewhere behind the front ranks of the English letter-writers. But he had more substance and his life had more meaning than has often been thought; and his letters, now that they are gathered together, permit us to see at first-hand, minutely, justly, and entertainingly, one of the more attractive fruits of modern culture—the eighteenth-century man of taste in his daily activities.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

John Skelton, Laureate. By WILLIAM NELSON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. vi + 266. \$3.00.

Although the publishers advertise William Nelson's *John Skelton, Laureate* as the "first full length biography in English of a poet who has gained increasing attention in recent years," the author in his Introduction describes his book as "an uncomfortable compromise between a collection of scattered papers concerning John Skelton and an orderly 'Life and Works.'" Through his long study of the works and his patient and painstaking search in the libraries and archives of America and England, Mr. Nelson discovered so many fascinating problems, or Skeltonic cruxes, that he wisely decided to place his emphasis on these rather than on phases that are better understood. So, although he traces Skelton's career from his earliest poetic efforts and even includes a chapter on "Reputation and Influence," he is most interested in placing Skelton in the Humanist tradition and relating him to the other

figures of Henry VII's court and in solving some of the problems connected with the less studied poems. He divides his work into eleven chapters: "The Scholars of Henry VII," "John Skelton, Humanist," "Tutor to the Prince," "The Origin of the Skeltonic Rhyme," "Skelton at Diss," "The Court of Henry VIII," "The Grammarians' War," "*Speak, Parrot*," "The Quarrel with Wolsey," "Reputation and Influence." He includes six appendices, a bibliography, and an index.

Nelson is of the opinion that his most significant contribution is his interpretation of *Speak, Parrot* and the relationship of it to Skelton's quarrel with Wolsey. This interpretation is based upon the author's solution of Skelton's peculiar calendar. He is able to show that the dates which are scattered through the second part of *Speak, Parrot*, and are given as "33" and "34," are related to the "21" which is to be found on one of Skelton's signatures. By dating this signature as of 1509 and relating the date to the "33" and "34," Mr. Nelson is able to show rather conclusively that the second section of *Speak, Parrot* should be dated in the fall of 1521. These dates and certain hints in the poem indicate that Skelton is here making a reference to Cardinal Wolsey's trip to the continent in 1521, and that the poet in the second part of *Speak, Parrot* is referring to the failure of Wolsey's mission and twitting him on some of his mistakes. I agree with Mr. Nelson that this chapter is a very important contribution. It is significant for its conclusions, but it is also a very valuable lesson in method, for it shows the result of a careful reading of an obscure poem with the light that can be thrown on it from a thorough knowledge of other works of the period, and the result of a careful, first-hand study of all manuscripts and printed works. Another interesting contribution is Mr. Nelson's theory of the origin of the Skeltonic rhyme. After discussing and rejecting previous theories, he comes to the conclusion that Skelton's "bastard rhyme" represents "an exaggerated development of the classical prose figure, 'like ending.'" I found the reasoning in this chapter very convincing. Students of the early Tudor period will be particularly interested in the first chapters and the discussion of the re-habilitation of Latin because of the necessity of the rulers to have men in their employ who could write and speak in Latin. Oratory and rhetoric were, therefore, of prime importance to courtiers and diplomats. Skelton was one of those early grammarians who achieved fame and some fortune in the courts of Henry the VIIIth and Henry the VIIIth.

Nelson has written with enthusiasm for his poet and his material, but he has avoided the temptation to allow his enthusiasm to cause him to do the usual appreciative work. Such a work appeared just before Nelson's book in the *John Skelton, An Account of His Life and Writings* by L. J. Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd's work is a chronological

résumé of Skelton's life, and an analysis of his writings. His criticism is almost entirely of the appreciative type, although he doesn't approve of all of Skelton's work. Nelson's work is a patient, exhaustive study of all the evidence which concerns certain problems in connection with Skelton. Although Nelson shows a great liking for and a full appreciation of Skelton's poetry, he is unwilling simply to give opinions and judgments without evidence. The book is sound, scholarly, and a very readable work.

RAY HEFFNER

The University of Washington

Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus, von FRIEDRICH JOSEPH SCHMITZ. *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, Vol. 23. University of California Press, Berkeley, California 1941. 152 pp.

The author begins with an analysis of European Individualism, which, in his opinion, grew out of the movements of Renaissance and Humanism, and attained its ideological peak in Central Europe during the eighteenth century. Although individualism is not clearly defined by the author, we may assume that he had two concepts of individualism in mind: on the one hand, an irrational approach to the theoretical problems of philosophy, and, on the other hand, a subjective attitude towards practical, moral and religious life. In this sense, the idea of individualism developed by Schmitz is to a certain extent related to the idea of qualitative individualism.

However, the author was not primarily interested in a full analysis of European individualism, but rather in its influence upon one of the leading personalities of cultural life in Central Europe at the time when the first climax of individualism was reached. This was Lessing, who (we follow the text of Schmitz) for the first time viewed moral, religious and literary questions from a particularly individualistic standpoint. Never before, not even by Klopstock, had such an individualistic standpoint been maintained, although there were many attempts by German writers to fight the anti-individualistic Scholasticism.

This is the gist of Schmitz's work. If it is true, we should expect a surprisingly new portrait of Lessing. For the present, however, Schmitz only wanted to prepare the material for such a picture. In this way, specifically strong irrational and subjective tendencies of letters, essays, poems and dramas of the young Lessing, a new essence of the *Litteratur-Briefe*, *Laokoon* and *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, new ideas within his *Emilia Galotti* and *Minna von Barnhelm* are laid bare. Thus, Lessing certainly seems to have

advocated a philosophy "von der aus das Leben nicht mehr rein verstandesmäßig nach einer seichten Zweckmäßigkeit beurteilt und abgeurteilt werden konnte, sondern in seiner tieferen Bedeutung und seinem tieferen Zusammenhang als solches gewertet werden konnte und mußte" (p. 58, 59).

Such a view of Lessing's character and work is opposed not only to the former studies on Lessing in which Lessing was taken for one of the most outstanding representatives of Enlightenment, but also to those studies and biographies of Lessing in which certain pietistic tendencies within Lessing's philosophy were conceded. Schmitz insists on irrationalism as the fundamental basis of Lessing's character and work.

One of the most striking facts of this study is that the author does not analyze Lessing's chief work, *Nathan the Wise*. It is likewise not clear why he does not discuss Lessing's "Humanitätsideal" and the problem of how far such an "Humanitätsideal", that obviously was in contrast to any individualistic outlook of life, could be combined with Lessing's alleged individualism. Although Schmitz quotes Jacobi, who revealed Lessing's Spinozism (p. 54, 55), he does not explain Lessing's particular adherence to Spinoza's philosophy in contrast to the different Spinozistic philosophies of Storm and Stress and Romanticism.

As a matter of fact, Lessing participated in certain individualistic tendencies of Pietism and Enlightenment. These tendencies chiefly served to substitute the missing ties of social and religious life that had crumbled with the downfall of medieval culture. In this way is to be explained the interest not only of Lessing, but also of most of his contemporaries, in secret alliances, freemasonry, etc. But we will not call such tendencies "individualistic", generally speaking.

The methodological standpoint of the author demands a special remark. He is of the opinion that within history the individual is not merely the product of the culture of his period, but also commands and controls this culture. Be that as it may (and certainly it is very different from such a simple characterization), the author is very much mistaken if he has found the history of ideas responsible for anti-individualistic historiography (pp. 1, 22, 64, etc.). Just the history of ideas lifted the individual to a higher level of importance, giving to him the new function that is defined by the term "Leistungsstruktur". That is, however, not the heroic individual that the author is looking for.

Since enthusiasm as well as the spirit of aggression is the privilege of youth (and Schmitz seems to be a young scholar) his study is to be taken more as a test of talent than as a conclusive scientific result. We certainly may expect valuable work from this author as soon as he has calmed the rapid pace of his thoughts. Finally, he may be advised to watch his German style carefully, if he continues to write in German.

GEORGE STEFANSKY

City College, New York

Five Studies in Literature. By B. H. BRONSON, J. R. CALDWELL, J. M. CLINE, GORDON MCKENZIE, and J. F. ROSS. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1940. Pp. 153. \$1.50.

These studies "were written to be published together," according to a prefatory statement; but the reviewer would find it so hard to describe what they have in common that his best resource is to notice them one by one, in the same chronological order in which they are here arranged.

Prof. B. H. Bronson (*Chaucer's Art in Relation to his Audience*) takes audience in its strict sense: listeners. What, he asks, was the effect upon Chaucer's narrative art of the oral rendition of his stories, which he must, sometimes at least, have contemplated? His focus wavers somewhat, and he seems at times to be discussing Chaucer's narrative technique in general. Yet he gathers a useful sheaf of observations that are strictly relevant. (He might profitably have cited the *Orlando Furioso* among instances of the oral custom he is concerned with.)

Prof. J. F. Ross (*Hamlet as Dramatist*) has as his theme "Hamlet's self-dramatization plus his dramaturgic temperament as a whole." This is to say, what Hamlet does and is constitutes in his own mind a rôle that he plays, and his delay in action (of which so many explanations have been made) is partly due to his desire to make his action as dramatic as possible. Prof. Ross's argument certainly adds something to our idea of the "melancholic" prince.

Prof. J. M. Cline (*Hydriotaphia*) is concerned with the paradoxical union in Sir Thomas Browne's thought of radical skepticism and Christian faith. He has no trouble in showing that the paradox is a familiar one in the seventeenth century, and is clearly stated and honestly faced in Browne's familiar quotation from Tertullian, *credo quia impossibile est*; but he is perhaps less convincing in trying to show that *Urn-burial* is the expression of paradox in aesthetic terms, both its construction and its style being (he argues) framed in the form of a conflict of contraries.

Prof. Gordon McKenzie (*Swift: Reason and some of its Consequences*) attempts to show that reason, in Swift's use, is not unlike Descartes' 'rational intuition.' It is, first, an immediate and direct apprehension of truth, not a logical process, and, secondly, it is absolutely right and certain. From reason, as so understood, and from the supplementary concept 'common sense,' Mr. McKenzie derives some of Swift's notable characteristics: his distrust of science, his love of unity and orthodoxy in church and state, and his intolerance, for instance. This is a closely-reasoned and (considering the nature of its subject) a clearly-reasoned study.

Finally, Prof. James R. Caldwell ("*Beauty is Truth . . .*")

studies Keats's famous dictum in the light of Hazlitt's aesthetic theorizing. It is probably true that Hazlitt helped Keats toward the idea that truth and beauty are one and indivisible, and it is certainly worth while to know this, and we should understand better what Keats meant if only we could be sure that we knew what *Hazlitt* meant. Mr. Caldwell does something, probably as much as possible, with this problem, but still not quite enough.

MORRIS W. CROLL

Princeton University

BRIEF MENTION

Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien. Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Volksliedarchiv. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1939. Teil II, Zweite Hälfte, pp. xi, 219-303. Teil III, Erste Hälfte, pp. 1-140. This monumental edition of German folksong is continued by two new half-volumes which bring the number of ballads now edited up to 59. The detailed study of the themes and the music has become even more extensive than in the earlier volumes and some of the introductions of the songs are veritable treatises. The discussion of "Ritter and Magd," for example, occupies no less than 45 quarto pages. The aspects of the *Deutsche Volkslieder* which deserve especial commendation are the exhaustive study of the history of the songs and the novel methods in the analysis of the musical texts. American ballad scholars seem not to have discovered these introductions. At least, I have not seen Meier's study of "Ritter and Magd" (III, 32-33) cited for its mention of "Lord Lovel" (Child, No. 75), "Fair Margaret and Sweet William" (Child, No. 74), "Lord Thomas and Fair Annet" (Child, No. 73), and "Lady Alice" (Child, No. 85) and its elaborate classification of related themes in European balladry, and the same might be said of many another introductory note. The introductory notes are quite in the manner set by Francis James Child, but the available texts have multiplied amazingly and the problems are correspondingly involved and difficult. The number of Modern Greek parallels which are cited is surprising, and this is but one sort of erudition which these introductions exemplify. The treatment of the music is beyond my competence to judge, but it is sufficient to say that even a tyro perceives that new methods are employed and new results are achieved. The *Deutsche Volkslieder* will stimulate the study of folksong as its great predecessors, Grundtvig's *Danmarks gamle folkeviser* and Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, have done.

ARCHER TAYLOR

The University of California, Berkeley

The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon. Edited, with an Introduction, by CHARLES F. MULLETT. San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xxiv + 64. \$1.75. A well-edited batch of letters from Dr. George Cheyne, Samuel Richardson's friend and physician, to the pious and sickly Selina, Countess of Huntingdon. Since they deal almost exclusively with her ladyship's digestive tract and the doctor's attempts to alleviate its ills by means of a rather faddish diet, their scope is as specialized as the most scholarly heart could desire. The letters would be of some value to students of medical practice and professional manners in the eighteenth century, but one hardly sees why the editor refers to them as "an interesting semiprofessional and social correspondence."

HOXIE N. FAIRCHILD

Hunter College

The Oxford Book of Christian Verse. Chosen and edited by LORD DAVID CECIL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. xxxiv + 560. \$3.00. An anthology of English religious verse drawn from "writers whose poems . . . are consistent with the doctrines of orthodox Christianity." Blake is the only heretic, and T. S. Eliot the only American. Your reviewer will not indulge in the futility of asking why this poem was included or that poem omitted: in such matters there can be no absolute standard. Lord Cecil knows English poetry better than most Christians, and he knows Christianity better than most students of literature. The result is a volume which reveals very impressively the power of the Christian religion to stimulate poetic utterance.

The twenty-two page Introduction offers some interesting critical observations on religious poetry but regrettably adds a misleadingly thin and hasty sketch of the history of the subject. The compiler says: "A representative anthology of English Christian Verse has also an additional non-literary interest. Christianity wears a different face to different people in different periods. . . . A collection of English Christian Verse is both a history of Christianity in England and an exhibition of the varieties of the religious temperament." Fortunately the text itself does not suggest that Lord Cecil has attempted the impossible task of combining critical and historical standards, for almost all of the poems seem to have been chosen for their intrinsic merit. The volume, while of course historically suggestive, is in no sense a tool of scholarship. It is simply a book from which the scholar may derive a great deal of literary pleasure and spiritual refreshment.

HOXIE N. FAIRCHILD

Hunter College

A Book of Danish Ballads, selected and with an introduction by AXEL OLRİK; translated by E. M. SMITH-DAMPIER. Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 337. \$3.00. This attractive volume was printed and published by the Princeton University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation. It is based on Olrik's two collections, *Danske Folkeviser i Udvalg* (1899) and *Danske Folkeviser i Udvalg, Anden Samling* (1909), which in turn were drawn from *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser*, the monumental work begun by Svend Grundtvig, continued by Olrik, and still incomplete after nearly 100 years of meticulous scholarly labor. Miss Smith-Dampier has given us English translations of 82 ballads, divided into the following groups: warrior ballads and ballads of magic (16); historical ballads (15); ballads of chivalry (18); ballads of satire (2); and miscellaneous ballads (31). The volume also includes an English translation of the introduction which Olrik wrote for his ballad-book of 1899. The work is meant for the general reader rather than for the scholar. It is well done and should prove useful to those for whom it was intended.

K. M.

Eiré, Histoire d'Irlande. By CHARLES M. GARNIER. Aubier, éditions Moutaigne. Paris, 1939. Pp. 270. 25 fr. This short history falls into 24 chapters, half of which are devoted to the 19th and 20th centuries. These are followed by a two-page bibliographical note. The author has given us a clear and reasonably accurate sketch of Irish history. He ends with the following statement (dated April 1939):

A présent un duel met aux prises les deux moitiés du monde: le totalitarisme . . . et l'humanisme démocratique . . . Les Irlandais d'Europe et leurs frères, répandus sur toute la terre, . . . sont prêts à collaborer à la lutte contre l'attaque possible, . . .

The attack was soon to take place, but the Irish, contrary to the author's expectations, did not prove ready to collaborate in the fight against totalitarian aggression.

K. M.

Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose. By SAMUEL K. WORKMAN. Princeton Studies in English, Vol. 18. Princeton, 1940. Pp. viii + 210. \$2.00. This doctoral dissertation is a superior piece of work. The author makes a close examination, "in whole or in part," of 38 translations made in the fifteenth century by 33 translators. He shows that "the fifteenth century writers produced more mature prose when translating than they did when independent." He infers that the influence of

translations had much to do with the development of English prose toward maturity in the course of the century; this the more since most of the English prose works of the time were translations. The inference seems justifiable. The dissertation is to be commended, not only because it is a sound treatment of an important subject, but also because it makes interesting reading. Unluckily there are a good many misprints. A few slips in matters of detail may be mentioned: on p. 3, "two hundred years before" should read "eight hundred years before"; on p. 30, the passage from Caxton's prologue to *Cathon* seems to have been misunderstood (*as* is pleonastic and *by cause* etc. is parallel to the preceding *if*-clause, with which it is coordinated by *and*); on p. 35, a dash after *erle* would clear up the construction of the sentence quoted; on p. 43, the generalization about "original English prose" should be qualified by adding "of the fifteenth century."

K. M.

Goethes Rede zum Shäkespears Tag. Wiedergabe der Handschrift. Mit einem Geleitwort von ERNST BEUTLER. Weimar: Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1938. 8 pp. Ms. and 19 pp. text. Aside from the interest the facsimile of this beautiful and important manuscript may claim (which on its Odyssey came from Frankfurt to Düsseldorf, thence to Egypt, Berlin, Vienna, Bonn and finally returned to Frankfurt in 1905), the publication is welcome on account of the accompanying terse and enlightening investigation, in which Beutler, with many an insight drawn from the archives of the Goethe-Museum, traces Goethe's relation to Shakespeare and the inspiration he received from him. The analysis of the oration itself goes deeper than any I have hitherto seen.

E. F.

The Classical Ideal in German Literature. An Introduction and an Anthology. By R. HINTON THOMAS, M. A. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes (1939). Pp. 126. 5/-. The plan of this book, to illustrate the concept of classicism by readings on certain themes such as the Legacy of Greece, Laokoon, the Humanitarian Ideal, the Conception of the Poet etc. from Kant to Kleist is an excellent one and the selection is effective. But it would, in the opinion of the reviewer, have been still more successful if the long general introduction, surveying in 29 pages German literature from the 16th century to the end of the 18th, had been omitted and if the texts had been treated inductively. What benefit could a student derive from a digest which mentions such authors as

Paul Schede and Johann Rölting unless he abstracted it from his own reading? English textbooks apparently suffer from the same traditional disease as ours, the unpedagogical striving for comprehensiveness. Yet, it must be said that we have no anthology that is as good as this one, which should be an incentive to our teachers to improve upon it.

E. F.

Baudelaire et la Belle aux cheveux d'or. Par ALBERT FEUILLERAT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. 99. An attractively written, printed, and illustrated booklet devoted to Marie Daubrun (Brunaud), the actress who, between Jeanne Duval and Mme Sabatier, inspired several of Baudelaire's poems. According to M. F. these are: *l'Irréparable*, *Chant d'automne*, *A une Madone*, *Poison*, *Ciel brouillé*, *Causerie*, *Chat* (the second), *Beau Navire*, *Invitation au voyage*. The last two had been supposed to be written under the influence of Jeanne. M. F. shows that B.'s fancy for Marie should not be dismissed as a momentary affair and that it had genuine importance in the history of his poetry.

H. C. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

MONTAIGNE AND DEMOCRACY. The article in your November issue by Jean David on "Quelques Aspects démocratiques de la philosophie de Montaigne" is disquieting indeed. Montaigne, in his nearly infinite wisdom, was the fountain-head, both in England and France, of liberal tendencies. From these was developed a political form of government which we are still allowed to venerate under the name of democracy. But what must we think of a "democracy" sired by a Bossuet, defender of the divine right of kings, a Barrès to whom the Germans owe part at least of their anti-Semitism, a Péguy in whom this present "confusion" has its roots, and a Bernard Faÿ, writing in 1940 on the "Liquidation du dix-huitième siècle"? The outraged shades of another great Gascon, Montesquieu, protest against this strange hybrid (compagnon de l'âne et du canard de Bérénice?) which calls itself "illiberal democracy."

NORMAN L. TORREY

Columbia University

LA DÉMOCRATIE DE MONTAIGNE. Que doit-on conclure des citations rapportées par M. David (*MLN.*, LVI, 485-92)? Qu'elles présentent "quelques aspects démocratiques dans la philosophie de Montaigne," ou, au contraire, et bien plutôt qu'elles révèlent en Montaigne un sceptique fidéiste, un relativiste? Montaigne se range du côté des hommes qui sont guidés dans la vie par les mœurs, les lois et la religion de leur pays, et se défient de la raison. Mais, parce que Montaigne se trouve ainsi porté à s'intéresser à l'art populaire et aux qualités qu'on rencontre dans le peuple, est-on fondé à conclure que c'est là une manifestation de son esprit "démocratique"? M. David rapproche Montaigne et Barrès; mais est-ce par souci de la "démocratie" que le député boulangiste qu'était Barrès à l'époque de Bérénice a parlé avec tendresse d'une petite fille du peuple? Et puis, peut-on parler de "la philosophie" de Montaigne, quand il faut bien convenir que Montaigne n'a jamais exprimé ses idées en un système lié? Sa pensée était bien trop souple, diverse et fuyante pour qu'on la saisisse facilement: "Il n'y a que les professeurs qui soient sûrs de le comprendre, parce que leur profession est de tout comprendre," a dit délicieusement A. France. Mais M. David s'intéresse aux problèmes actuels; il veut se poser en défenseur de la "démocratie" ou plutôt de "l'aristocratie dans la démocratie." Il cherche à trouver en Montaigne un allié. C'est pour cela que, faisant appel à M. Lucien Romier, il croit pouvoir déclarer que "Montaigne sépare la notion de privilège de l'idée d'aristocratie." L'exemple de M. David ne montre-t-il pas l'impossibilité qu'il y a à vouloir s'occuper des problèmes que soulèvent les questions de "démocratie" et de "libéralisme," quand on ne voit dans l'évolution des événements qu'un conflit d'idées? Devons-nous conclure, avec Albert Sorel, que "la philosophie intellectualiste est vraiment d'une incompétence radicale pour l'explication des grands mouvements historiques," qu'on ne peut comprendre la position de Montaigne, de Voltaire, ou de Montesquieu qu'en tenant compte d'autres aspects de leur pensée que les aspects purement intellectuels et littéraires? Rappelons la remarque d'Albert Mathiez: "Il faut beaucoup de bonne volonté et d'aveuglement pour trouver, comme l'ont écrit beaucoup d'historiens de la littérature, que Montesquieu a certainement une prédilection pour l'Etat démocratique. C'est exactement le contraire qui est la vérité." Ce qui est vrai de Montesquieu l'est-il de Montaigne?

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Addison, Joseph.—Letters. Edited by Walter Graham. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1941. Pp. xxxvi + 527. \$8.00.

Anderson, O. S. (ed.)—Old English material in the Leningrad manuscript of Bede's Ecclesiastical History. *Lund*: Gleerup [*London*: Humphrey Milford], 1941. Pp. viii + 165; 3 plates. (Skrifter utgivna av kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund acta reg. societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis, xxxi.)

Belasco, David.—*The heart of Maryland*, and other plays. Ed. with introd. and notes by Glenn Hughes and George Savage. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. Pp. xii + 319. \$5.00. (America's Lost Plays, xviii.)

Bennett, Whitman.—Whittier, bard of freedom. *Chapel Hill, N. C.*: U. of N. C. Press, [1941]. Pp. xvi + 359. \$3.50.

Chapman, George.—Poems. Edited by Phyllis Brooks Bartlett. *New York*: Modern Language Association, 1941. Pp. xii + 488. \$5.00. (MLA, General Series, xii.)

De Mille, Henry C.—The plays, written in collaboration with David Belasco. Edited by Robert Hamilton Ball. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. Pp. xxvi + 342. \$5.00. (America's Lost Plays, xvii.)

Dodds, John W.—Thackeray: a critical portrait. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1941. Pp. x + 257. \$3.00.

Foerster, Norman, McGalliard, John C., Wellek, René, Warren, Austin, and Schramm, Wilbur L.—Literary scholarship, its aims and methods. *Chapel Hill, N. C.*: U. of N. C. Press, 1941. Pp. xii + 269. \$3.00.

Hayakawa, S. I.—Language in action. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, [1941]. Pp. x + 245. \$2.00.

Menner, Robert J. (ed.)—The poetical dialogues of Solomon and Saturn. *New York*: Mod. Lang. Ass'n., 1941. Pp. xii + 176. (MLA, Monograph Series, xiii.)

Monroe, N. Elizabeth.—The novel and society, a critical study of the modern novel. *Chapel Hill, N. C.*: U. of N. C. Press, 1941. Pp. x + 282. \$3.00.

Ness, Frederic W.—The use of rhyme in Shakespeare's plays. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 168. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 95.)

Reinehr, Sister Mary Joan, O. S. F., Ph. D.—The writings of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, an

introduction and study. *Milwaukee, Wisc.*: Marquette U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 223. \$2.50.

Walpole, Horace.—Correspondence. Ed. W. S. Lewis and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. Vols. 9-10—With George Montagu. *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U. Press, 1941. Pp. lvi + 418 and viii + 560. \$15.00 (2 volumes).

GERMAN

Apel, Joh. August.—Die Freischützsaage und ihre Wandlungen. Vom Gespensterbuch zur Oper. Neuausgabe der Freischützsaage aus dem "Gespensterbuch" [Auszug]. Hrsg. u. mit einer Einführung versehen von Otto Daube. *Detmold*: Schnelle [1941]. 23 pp., 2 plates. 80 Pf.

Dzulko, Ruth.—Studien zur isländischen Lyrik der Gegenwart. Diss. [Sprache und Kultur der germ. u. roman. Völker, B, Bd. 33]. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1941. x, 120 pp. M. 4.50.

Hiss, Albert.—Die Flurnamen von Eichstetten am Kaiserstuhl. Im Zusammenhang mit der Orts- u. Wirtschaftsgeschichte nach sachlichen und sprachlichen Gesichtspunkten ausgewertet. Mit 1 Karte u. 3 Bildern. [Badische Flurnamen. Bd. 2, H. 6]. Diss. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1940. 162 pp. M. 9.

Jahrbuch der deutschen Sprache. Hrsg. von einer Arbeitsgemeinschaft unter Leitung von Dr. Werner Schulze. Jg. 1. *Leipzig*: J. Klinkhardt, 1941. 240 pp. M. 5.80.

Klöpzig, Walther.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur nach Entwicklungsperioden. 4. Aufl. Die Kapitel vom Naturalismus bis zur Gegenwart sind verfasst von Walther Linden. [Reclams Univ.-Bibl. 7200-7202]. *Leipzig*: Reclam [1940]. 233 pp. M. 1.05.

Kluckhohn, Paul.—Das Ideengut der deutschen Romantik. [Handbücherei der Deutschkunde. Bd. 6]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1941. vi, 190 pp. M. 4.60.

Michel, Wilhelm.—Das Leben Friedrich Hölderlins. *Bremen*: Schünemann [1940]. 580 pp. 8 plates. M. 11.

Miller, Edmund E.—The Hundred Year History of the German Correspondent, Baltimore, Maryland. *Baltimore*: Baltimore Correspondent Printing Co., 1941. 24 pp. \$0.25.

Redentin Easter Play, The. Translated from the Low German of the fifteenth century with an Introduction and Notes by A. E. Zucker. [Records of Civilization Sources and Studies, no. 32]. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1941. x, 134 pp. \$2.00.

Rieschel, Hanspeter.—Tragisches Wollen. Untersuchungen zum Leben u. Schaffen Heinrich von Kleists. Diss. Göttingen. [Theater u. Drama, Bd. 12]. *Berlin*: Elsner, 1939. 97 pp. M. 3.

Schlager, Paul.—Goethe-Literatur des Jahres 1940. Zusammengestellt aus der

Deutschen Nationalbibliographie (Gesamtverzeichnis des reichsdeutschen Schrifttums u. der deutschsprachlichen Schriften des Auslandes). [Veröffentlichungen d. Goethe-Ges. H. 2]. *Leipzig*: Bohn, 1941. 11 pp. 80 Pf.

Stöckli, Alban.—Der Minnesänger Herr Heinrich von der Mure. Eine literarische Studie. *Wohlen, Argau*: Meyer, 1941. 17 pp.

Vancsa, Kurt.—Franz Grillparzer. Bild und Forschung. *Wien I*: Verein f. Landeskunde von Niederdonau u. Wien, 1941. 56 pp., 6 plates. M. 2.

FRENCH

Andreas Capellanus.—The Art of Courtly Love, with introd., translation and notes by J. J. Parry. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941. xii + 218 pp. \$2.75.

Bird, C. W.—A. de Vigny's *Chatterton*: A Contrib. to the Study of Its Genesis and Sources. *Los Angeles*: Lymanhouse, 1941. viii + 183 pp. \$3.00.

Bond, O. F.—La Ronde de la vie, a cultural anthology. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. viii + 135 pp. \$0.48.

Chamard, H.—Histoire de la Pléiade. T. IV. *Paris*: Didier, 1940. x + 312 pp.

Mornet, Daniel.—Histoire de la litt. fr. classique, 1660-1700, ses caractères véritables, ses aspects inconnus. *Paris*: Armand Colin, 1940. 426 pp. Fr. 70.

Perceval, The Didot, ed. William Roach. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa. Press, 1941. xii + 348 pp. \$4.00.

Rey, H. A.—*Au clair de la lune* and other Fr. nursery songs. *New York*: Greystone Press, 1941. 30 pp. (illustrated). \$2.00.

Studies by Members of the Fr. Dept. of Yale U., ed. A. Feuillerat [*Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, Gomberville, Corneille, Voltaire, Baudelaire, "La Plume"]. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1941. 353 pp. \$3.00. (Yale Romanic Studies, 18.)

Travers, Seymour.—Catalogue of Nineteenth Century French Theatrical Parodies (1789-1914). *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1941. 132 pp. \$2.00.

U. of N. C. Studies in the Romance Langs. and Lits. II. M. E. Maxfield, Raeto-Romance Bibliog.; *De Passione Judas*, ed. N. Iseley; *Seth*, ed. H. H. Hilton, Jr. *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. C., 1941. 61 pp. III. Pierre Le Loyer's Version of the *Ars amatoria*, ed. W. L. Wiley. *Ibid.*, 1941. 74 pp.

Vignerat, M.—Chansons de France. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. viii + 52 pp. \$0.25.

ITALIAN

Kennard, Joseph Spencer.—A Literary History of the Italian People. *New York*: Macmillan, 1941. 418 pp. \$5.00.

Trevelyan, R. C.—Translations from Leopardi. *Cambridge University Press*, 1941. 59 pp. \$1.25.

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Cano, Juan and Edith Cameron.—Cinco Novelitas y un Cuento. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. vi + 270 pp. \$1.48.

Espinosa, A. M., Jr.—Cuentitos fáciles. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1939. 62 pp. \$0.30.

Galdós.—Trafalgar, ed. R. Espinosa and A. R. Heffer. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1941. 63 pp.

Granada, Luis de.—Maravilla del mundo, ed. Pedro Salinas, 1940. 140 pp. 18 cms.

Heffer, A. R. and Ramón Espinosa.—Primeras Lecturas. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1941. 62 pp. \$0.30.

Levy, Bernard.—Present-Day Spanish. Revised ed. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1941. xvi + 376 pp. \$1.75.

Rincón Gallardo, C.—Manganas y peales a la XVI ed. del Diccionario de la Acad. Esp. *Mexico*: Libr. de Ángel, 1939. 68 pp. \$1.25 Mex.

Tirso de Molina.—El burlador; El condenado por desconfiado; La prudencia en la mujer. Introd. de P. Henríquez Ureña. *Buenos Aires*: Losada, 1939. 268 pp. \$3.00 arg.

—El condenado por desconfiado, ed. A. González Palencia. *Zaragoza*: Ebro, 1939.

—Los tres maridos burlados, ed. D. Schons and M. C. Johnston. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1939. 56 pp.

Torres-Rioseco, A.—Grandes Novelistas de la América Hispana. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1941. x + 280 pp. \$3.50.

Valle-Inclán, R. del.—Sonata de Primavera. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1941. 191 pp. \$1.15.

Walsh, G. M.—Cuentos Criollos. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. xxvi + 207 pp. \$1.48.

Willis, R. S., Jr. and F. B. Agard.—Spanish from Thought to Word. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. xiv + 241 pp. \$1.95.

Wofsy, S. A.—Easy Sp. Readings. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1940. xi + 174 pp. \$1.25.

GENERAL

Ryans, D. G.—Measuring the intellectual and cultural backgrounds of teaching candidates. *New York*: Am. Council on Education, 1941. 28 pp.

Univ. of Colorado studies. Series B. Studies in the Humanities, I, no. 4. P.-L. Faye, *Dada*; R. E. Warner, *Piezoto*; R. A. Cox, *Recent Fr. Drama*; G. Loose, *Th. Mann*; W. Brun, *Fr. Werfel*. *Boulder*, 1941. 98 pp. \$1.00.

1942

n Leo-
1941.

Cinco
1941.

áciles.
32 pp.

a and
Press,

undo,
ms.

sa. —
rd U.

nish.
1941.

les a
Esp.
\$1.25

con-
en la
reña.
3.00

L. A.
39.

D.
Ox-

s de
Cal.

ma-
191

on:

ish
ace-

ew
pp.

ual
di-
on,

es
re,
x,
v.
p.

CARLYLE AND THE SAINT-SIMONIANS

The Concept of Historical Periodicity

By HILL SHINE

This study attempts to show the entry of a French influence into British thought of the Nineteenth Century. By tracing the impact of the Saint-Simonian concept of history upon Carlyle's writings after 1830, it supplements recent investigations into the sources of Carlyle's thought. And it suggests a fundamental relation between his philosophy of history and his social philosophy.

The material examined in preparation of this study includes some fugitive publications by the Saint-Simoniens and two interesting but unpublished fragments by Carlyle.

13 + 191 pages. \$2.25

TEN OLD ENGLISH POEMS

PUT INTO MODERN ENGLISH ALLITERATIVE VERSE

By KEMP MALONE

"The poems here brought together have been put into modern English but otherwise have been changed as little as possible. The rendering is as literal as I could make it within the verse form used, and the verse follows faithfully (though not with absolute strictness) the rules governing the composition of classical Old English poetry. . . . Made as a labor of love, these modernizations are now put into print in the hope that they may lead some lovers of poetry to the old poems themselves. . . . Six of the poems are taken from the *Exeter Book*, the earliest anthology of English poetry. The other four are drawn from various sources. In date, the ten poems range from the seventh century to the tenth. The two love poems have a special interest, . . ."

x + 50 pages. \$1.25

From the Preface

GRONGAR HILL

By JOHN DYER

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

By RICHARD C. BOYS

John Dyer's "Grongar Hill" generally shares with the more important *Seasons* the credit for helping to re-awaken an interest in external nature in Augustan England. But although most of the quiet fame it has today is due to the poem's historical importance, "Grongar Hill" is well worth reading on its own merits. The complimentary remarks of such critics as Dr. Johnson and Wordsworth are proof of this.

For the first time a careful study of the various texts of the poem has been made. Since the final text of "Grongar" is available in anthologies the emphasis here is on the earlier versions, the first octosyllabic text being printed opposite the Pindarics. Variant readings from the heroic-couplet fragment and from the other octosyllabic versions are also given. For those readers who wish to see the poem in its best form the final text has been included. In an attempt to clear up the confusion surrounding the order of the various versions, the editor has examined them carefully and has arranged them accordingly.

Roughly half of the book is taken up with the text, while the remaining space is devoted to pertinent material about John Dyer and "Grongar Hill." Much of this is illuminating and pleasant reading based on accounts in travel books, the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments, etc. For this reason the book, which is handsomely bound and printed, should appeal to the amateur interested in eighteenth-century poetry as well as to the professional scholar.

xi + 114 pages. \$1.75

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE, MARYLAND



For correct, modern, idiomatic Spanish

L. H. TURK'S

Introduction to Spanish

A brief, comprehensive treatment in thirty lessons and five reviews with provision for mastery of fundamentals through extensive classroom experience.

*Practical, limited vocabulary
Abundant, well-graded readings
Striking photographs—colored maps
Handsome binding*

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

SHORT STORIES FOR STUDY

R. W. SHORT
R. B. SEWALL
YALE UNIVERSITY

REPRESENTATIVE ADOPTIONS

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, QUEENS COLLEGE, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF OMAHA, VASSAR COLLEGE, WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, WILLIAMS COLLEGE, YALE UNIVERSITY.

\$1.40

HOLT

257 FOURTH AVE.

NEW YORK
